

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WITH every fresh book that is published, the problem of the Psalter grows more perplexing ; and the improbability of reaching results which will be universally regarded as 'assured' will certainly not be diminished by Professor R. H. KENNETT's discussion of the problem in his recently published collection of *Old Testament Essays* (Cambridge University Press ; 12s. 6d. net). The chapter which deals with 'The Historical Background of the Psalms,' and which covers no less than a hundred pages, is much the longest and most elaborate in the book. The whole argument is marked by the wide knowledge, and the conclusion by the daring and originality, which we have long been accustomed to expect from the Cambridge Professor.

For in the realm of Old Testament investigation Dr. KENNETT goes his own way, which is not seldom a lonely way. Besides the chapter on the Psalms, this volume contains chapters on The Jahvistic Document, Ezekiel, The Jewish Priesthood, The Altar Fire, The Day of Atonement, and The Origin and Development of the Messianic Hope ; and on every one of these themes Professor KENNETT has something unconventional to say. Any one who will contrast, for example, his treatment of the Messianic Hope with that of Canon STORR in the volume 'From Abraham to Christ,' which has appeared almost simultaneously, will see how little Dr. KENNETT cares to tread the beaten path.

A writer who defends the thesis that the Jahvist document, or at any rate the first draft of it, was written between 621 and 604 B.C. as a counterblast to Josiah's reformation, that the Elohist document was drawn up about 650 or perhaps somewhat later for the benefit of the heterogeneous population of Samaria who had then been brought to accept the religion of Jehovah, and that the date of the Chronicler is late in the second century B.C., is certainly not lacking in courage.

There are other equally challenging statements, which will give readers of a conventional type considerable food for thought. Perhaps the most startling is that made in the chapter on The Altar Fire in connexion with the story of Elijah's sacrifice. It is this : 'There is no difficulty in supposing that at this ancient sanctuary (*i.e.* Carmel) the altar fire had been habitually kindled by the same method as the altar fire at Jerusalem, and that a supply of naphtha was kept on the spot for the purpose. This method may have been unknown to the Tyrian priests ; or, if it was known, and they had naphtha available, there may have been something in the atmospheric conditions which caused them to fail. We need not suppose that Elijah would have been very scrupulous in the means he employed to bring about the victory of Jehovah over Baal ; nevertheless it must be remembered that he doubtless sincerely believed that fire kindled by means of a mirror reflecting the sun's rays was really fire from heaven.'

It is hardly necessary to say that Dr. KENNETT is not here drawing upon his imagination, but that he rests his case upon an important but little known passage in 2 Mac 1¹⁹⁻³⁶, which expressly says that on another occasion, after the Exile, the altar fire had been kindled by 'a thing which Nehemiah and they that were with him called Nephthar, which is by interpretation, Cleansing; but most men call it Nephthai.'

We therefore approach the discussion on the Psalter with high expectations of an unconventional treatment, and assuredly we are not disappointed. The conclusion, towards which the whole argument converges, is that there is no valid reason against the theory that the Psalter, as we have it, is a hymn-book, or rather a collection of hymn-books, belonging to the Maccabæan age, and that the date of its compilation may be roughly set about 130 B.C.

In another essay the case for the late date is thus succinctly summarized. 'The three main divisions of the Psalter, namely, Book I., Books II. and III., and Books IV. and V., were all compiled in the second century B.C., the first two collections being originally *synagogue* collections subsequently taken over by the Temple. I believe that Book I. emanated from a Judæan synagogue (or synagogues) and that the Elohist recension of Books II. and III. (with the exception of Psalms 84-89) is due to this collection of Psalms having been written down in a district in which the population was largely heathen, and where there was a constant danger of the profanation of the sacred name by the heathen.'

In defence of this thesis Dr. KENNETT displays much originality. It is universally admitted that Books II. and III. represent an Elohist recension. Dr. KENNETT asks at what period that recension finds its most natural explanation. He reminds us that, while Malachi and the Priestly Code have no hesitation in writing the *tetragrammaton* (יהוה), by the time the LXX translation of the law was made ארני had come to be substituted in pronunciation for יהוה: in other words, the practice seems to

have originated sometime between the middle of the fifth and the beginning of the third century B.C., and it is doubtless to be connected with the advent of the Hellenism introduced by Alexander (332 B.C.).

But though between 332 and 270 B.C. the Jews had ceased to pronounce the *tetragrammaton*, through fear that it might be irreverently pronounced by the heathen who had heard it on Jewish lips, there is no evidence that they had as yet any scruple in writing it. That scruple would only emerge when Jewish books were in danger of profanation by the heathen. When was that? The only period within our knowledge, argues Dr. KENNETT, when Jewish books were exposed to the peril of destruction was the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (175-165 B.C.).

The difference between Book I. where יהוה is freely used, and Books II. and III. where אלהים predominates, is not due to a difference of date, but of locality. The psalms in the former collection were compiled for the synagogues in Judæa, where, from 165 B.C., the worship of Jehovah was a *religio licita* and the Scriptures were in general safe from profanation; those in the latter collection reflect the situation of the Jews *outside Judæa*—in Galilee, Idumæa, etc.—where, from 168 to 141, any Jewish Scriptures would be in danger of being profaned by the heathen.

There are psalms, Dr. KENNETT admits, such as Ps 23, which might have been composed at any date of a period covering several centuries; but, he contends, wherever there is an unmistakable reference to some historical background, this reference can be explained without doing any violence to the language from the known history of the second century B.C. He proceeds to substantiate this thesis by an examination, covering seventy-two pages, of practically all the psalms.

This part of the discussion will be scrutinized with suspicious care by those who are reluctant to believe that the whole of the Hebrew Psalter can be accommodated within a narrow space of

the second century B.C., and, skilful and plausible as the plea may be, they will rise from it, we fear, unconvinced. Take a few illustrations. Ps 15, we are told, would seem to have been composed in or shortly after December 165 B.C. Who is to have the custody of the recovered Temple? Not such people as Jason or Menelaus, but those who are loyal to the religion of Jehovah. But a psalm emphasizing the moral aspect of religion might surely have been composed at any time within or after the great period of prophecy. Naturally Ps 24 is also relegated to the Maccabæan period, to which 'every word of it is absolutely suitable.' Doubtless; but equally suitable to many another period.

Ps 40, with its apparent disparagement of sacrifice, 'is perfectly explicable in the mouth of those who are prevented from taking part in the prescribed ritual of the Temple,' but equally explicable as an utterance of the pre-exilic period, as indeed Dr. KENNETT practically admits when he says it is based on teaching of the great pre-exilic prophets. Again, Ps 46 'belongs apparently to the conclusion of the struggle about 141 B.C.,' Ps 51 'must be dated in the latest phase of the Maccabæan struggle.' And thus Dr. KENNETT pursues his intrepid way through the Psalter to a conclusion which would be vigorously repudiated by many of the best Old Testament scholars, who are becoming increasingly convinced that there is not a little pre-exilic material in the Psalter.

Dr. KENNETT conducts his difficult argument with skill, but we should be sorry indeed to find ourselves driven to accept his conclusions: for that would mean that nearly a millennium had passed, leaving practically no record in sacred song of a religious experience admittedly unique. We find it impossible to believe that a people so poetically gifted, even in the eleventh or twelfth century B.C., as the Song of Deborah shows the Hebrew people to have been, and so religiously endowed as to produce the incomparable prophets of the eighth, seventh, and sixth centuries B.C.—a people, too, so tenacious of the religious treasures of the past—should have left no trace of the songs

in which for centuries they had lifted up their hearts to God.

Last year Congregationalists held a Conference at Oxford to discuss the basis of faith. The topic selected was Authority, and it may be remembered that, for outsiders at least, the results of the discussions were singularly meagre and unsatisfactory. The report of the Conference gave one sympathetic reader the impression of men groping in a dim twilight; the general effect on the outside lay world cannot have been very heartening.

Another Conference has been held in the same place this year, and the same subject was again considered. We are reminded of an incident that took place in Edinburgh about forty years ago, when secularism was rampant and aggressive throughout the country. An Edinburgh minister of some eminence as a preacher engaged in open debate with prominent secularists, and came off second best. Professor Calderwood of the Moral Philosophy Chair in the University was in the chair, and at the close intimated that a second meeting would be held the following Sunday, and that he himself would take up the cudgels for Christianity. The debate took place before a crowded audience, and Calderwood, who was an ideal man for the purpose, overwhelmed his antagonists both by his knowledge and his readiness of speech.

The story is recalled because something similar has happened at Oxford. This second Conference has been in every way far more satisfactory than the first. For the most part the speakers were clearer in their statements, and far more confident and positive in their attitude. Those who read the report which appears in *The Congregational Quarterly* for October will find some real help in the papers. Some of the names are new to us; others are those of well-known Congregationalist leaders, like Dr. Vernon BARTLET, Dr. SELBIE, and Dr. Sydney CAVE. But all the papers are good, and one gains the impression that the Church has something definite and valuable to give to the world.

The four sources of authority are discussed in turn, the Bible, the Church, our Lord Jesus Christ, and Science. So far as the Church is concerned it was made perfectly clear that Congregationalists have no use for authority in the form in which it is interpreted in the Roman Church—as a power to compel thought and require submission. The claim of any one Church to such authority is disproved by history, and it is equally disproved in practice, for the Spirit of God has never in the Christian era been confined to one channel: a theory of authority which obliged one-half of Christendom to unchurch the other stands self-condemned. Attempts to justify it in the end impugn the integrity of the Holy Spirit. In addition to that the claim of one Church to indefectibility and infallibility sounds ridiculous in face of patent facts. _____

As an infallible authority the Bible cannot claim any similar allegiance from Christian minds. This was a matter of general agreement at the Conference. The reasons are obvious to educated minds. They are almost taken for granted at such a Conference. The Bible, as a record of a revelation of God, is a human medium, with all the imperfections that attach to everything human. It is also the record of a growing revelation, and it is impossible at any stage short of the highest (in Christ) to say of any stage of the revelation, 'this is the final truth about God.' And so the Bible is put aside as a final and infallible authority. Few scholars will question this conclusion. But it has to be remembered that vast multitudes outside such a Conference are still unenlightened as to the facts which compel the conclusion, and if the Bible is to be set aside as a final authority, its true claims to our reverence and faith must be made clear to the ordinary religious mind. _____

If the Church and the Bible do not give us the authority we seek, is that to be found in ourselves? One of the speakers said that 'our ultimate authority in religion is found within and not without. We can accept as authoritative for us only those facts or truths which win the assent of the reason and conscience and are vindicated in history

and experience.' But the question at once arises, 'Who is to decide what truths are thus authenticated?' And it must be admitted that the speaker found little support in the Conference. It is true that we can accept as authoritative only what commends itself to our reason and experience. But, on the other hand, there are times when the inner light is darkened—such times as those of deep distress or disaster. It is well to emphasize the subjective side of authority, because reason and conscience are good watch-dogs, and nothing ought to settle in our minds that they do not pass. But we must not, as it was pointed out, emphasize this subjective side to the prejudice of the claims of a real objective authority. _____

And this brings us to the question: Is Jesus Christ the final and absolute authority? Nothing in the Conference was so really satisfying as the way in which this question was handled and the conclusion to which it led. It was discussed in two papers, one by Dr. Sydney CAVE, the other by the Rev. T. C. RAE, a minister at Norwich. Dr. CAVE is shy of the word 'authority.' He does not seem to like it. He prefers to speak of 'revelation,' and he says that when we speak of Christ as Divine 'we are not so much assenting to a statement of a creed as affirming a way of life; claiming that the values for which He stood are eternal and Divine; that God is as He was; that the holy love His life and death reveal is the final secret of God's character and rule, and so must be the standard by which we face our problems.' This is not altogether satisfactory, and does not touch the crucial point. _____

The Rev. T. C. RAE was more robust, and his paper seems to us to be one of the best read at the Conference. 'Christian history bears witness,' he writes, 'with unwavering voice to the fact that men and women, in every age, have been so conscious of the constraint of Christ, that He has become for them the regulative authority of their every thought and deed. . . . Subjecting themselves to Christ's authority, men find themselves in the *Divine* presence and entering into an ever-deepening knowledge of God . . . the conscious-

ness of Jesus also vindicates the claim that in Him men meet the authority of God.' For this writer Christ is the Authority we seek, and the final one. And he does justice to the element of subjectivity that must enter into any such relation of submission when he points out that 'before an authority can be valid for me it must be experienced as an inner power.' The authority of God is the authority of constraint, for it exists to command the will and the heart. 'Such authority, therefore, can be tested only by its power to achieve its purpose.'

It would not be too much to say that this was the main positive conclusion of the Conference. That is why it was so much more successful than its predecessor. It is true that the mind is left putting questions. We may ask, for example, which picture of Christ is to constrain us, for there are at least three in the New Testament—the Synoptic, the Pauline, and the Johannine. The answer to this is given by implication in more than one paper. The Living Christ is the final authority for us, authenticated in His claims and in the experience of the ages. Another question that rises in the mind is, Can we be sure that the picture of Christ presented to us is historical? This question was not raised in the Conference, but it was repeatedly answered by anticipation. The picture of Jesus is self-authenticating. Look at Him, study Him, face Him, and He reveals Himself.

Such conferences as this recent one are bound to be fruitful when so positive a note is struck, and when we are assured that the Church has a great message for the need and the hunger of men. Miss Mary GLOVER, who writes some impressions of it in *The Congregational Quarterly*, says that it left her with a quickened sense that we may be standing upon the threshold of a wonderful time. Science and scholarship have both cleared the way to God. No Christian generation since the first has seen Jesus of Nazareth as clearly as we may see Him. We have only begun to understand Him; but we realize that in this present year of our Lord, 'God is doing things.'

An interesting, useful, and suggestive, if also provocative, book appears under the name of Mr. E. E. KELLETT, author of 'The Story of Myths.' It is entitled *A Short History of the Jews* (Routledge; 7s. 6d. net), and its aim is to give a *rational* account from the standpoint of modern Old Testament criticism of the development of Jewish history, beginning with Moses and ending with the reduction of Jerusalem by Titus. 'We know roughly why Athens rose and why she fell; why Greece was able to resist Persia but could not resist Philip of Macedon; why Rome thrust back Hannibal but succumbed to Alaric. And, unless we discover the *natural* reason why the Israelite people resisted Philistia but fell to Nebuchadnezzar, and why, though scattered by Titus, it still lives in conscious unity though dispersed, we may have been reading an interesting tale, but we certainly have not been reading history.'

It is an elaborate Introduction, considering the compass of his sketch of Jewish history, that Mr. KELLETT supplies. It contains a survey of the nature of the sources from which the succeeding narrative is drawn, and also a preliminary outline study of the story of Israel, especially as it bears on early Jewish literature. His apology for the amount of repetition thus involved might be regarded as merely ingenious were it not also true and convincing: 'If brevity is the soul of wit, repetition is the heart of understanding.' It is a saying which the teacher or preacher would do well to remember. Many a good exposition misses its mark because the expositor knows not, or will not condescend to employ, the art of repetition.

A feature of the book, which adds much to its interest, is the large use Mr. KELLETT makes of literary and historical parallels from English and classical literature. For example, speaking of the writer of the Book of Judges, he finds a true parallel to him not in Tacitus, still less in Thucydides, and not even in Plutarch: 'Could we find an Icelandic Saga, based on oral tradition, in which the Sagaman sought to convey an ethical or religious lesson, we should have nearly the exact parallel we wish.'

Nearest of all is perhaps one of those Lives of Saints, such, for example, as Eddi's "Life of St. Wilfred," in which the pious writer's aim is only secondarily to tell the literal truth, and primarily to exalt the merits of his hero and further the great cause of the Church, with which he believes the good of his country to be inextricably bound up.'

Mr. KELLETT's critical position is well illustrated in the foregoing words, and two further quotations will serve still further to illustrate it. The first may be taken as a reminder that when criticism—even advanced criticism—has done its work, a substantial core of historical truth may remain in the Biblical narrative: 'Moses was rightly regarded by Israel as its true founder; and few more influential men have ever been born into the world than this half-legendary leader of a small wandering clan. So great was his name among his own people that they ascribed to him a long and most complicated set of laws, and the composition of five volumes to which they paid a reverence even more profound than that yielded by Islam to the Koran. This reverence, despising the dust of death and the darkness of centuries, is sufficient to prove the greatness of the man.'

The second quotation may be taken as a reminder that even advanced criticism does not necessarily stand for radical conclusions, and incidentally as illustrative once more of the wide sweep of Mr. KELLETT's net in its search for literary and historical parallels. Of David the outlaw and warrior he writes: 'That such a man should also have been a poet—that in the midst of these scapes and perils he should have composed any of these Psalms which have been ascribed to him, might seem utterly impossible. To Westerners, indeed, it is so. We can hardly picture William Wallace, during his flight from Falkirk, as making an elegy on his misfortunes, or the Black Prince, during the pursuit after Poitiers, as chanting a psalm of triumph. But the Eastern mind is different.'

Then comes the reference to which we have been leading up: 'We think of Babar, in one of his many flights from murderous foes, escaping into a cave, watching the enemy ride harmless by, and then sitting down to compose a lyric in the language and manner of Hafiz. There is much in the great Mogul Conqueror that reminds us of David; and we can only wish that the resemblance had been yet closer, and that the Hebrew, like the Moham-medan, had left us his own authentic memoirs.'

Natban Söderblom.

BY PROFESSOR M. TOR ANDRAE, D.D., UNIVERSITY OF STOCKHOLM.

If it is fortunate for a country that its reputation abroad depends upon the most typical and genuine representatives of the race, then Sweden and its churches may consider themselves fortunate indeed that the Archbishop of Upsala is one of the small number of Swedes of to-day who have a place amongst international personalities. For he is a genuine Swede to the depths of his being.

Hälsingland, a very old district of Sweden, the land of the white high-towering birches, and of the dark blue lofty mountains, is his native land. 'Hälsingland,' thus he writes himself, 'has two landscapes in the grand style. One is the valley of the river Ljusnan. In its ceaseless move-

ment the river is symbolical of the activity and energy which characterize the inhabitants of this well-to-do district. For timber, which is here one of the principal sources of revenue, the river is an indispensable roadway. The second great landscape is the basin of the Dellenseen, a world in itself, which maintained an isolated existence longer than the rest of the district round about Ljusnan, a world whose dreamy stillness lends its impress to the people.'

The family to which Söderblom belongs springs from peasant stock in the valley of Ljusnan. His remarkable activity, zeal, and energy might thus be regarded as an inheritance from the land of the

swift-flowing streams. He passed his childhood in his father's manse. Here he learned two lessons which were of real value for his future life-work. Like many Swedish clergymen of peasant extraction, Jonas Söderblom cultivated his glebe-land himself. The eldest son had early to help with the work in field and meadow, as far as his school work permitted. During his student years the greater part of the summer vacation was spent in hard farm-work. Such an upbringing naturally led to a thorough understanding of the everyday realities of life, bringing with it a healthy contact with mother earth, and forming an inestimable counterpoise to restless intellectual activity. Archbishop Söderblom has worked all his life, by preference after that American method which knows how to utilize every moment and every ounce of strength. His early training was to be of great use. Only one who has had experience of hard manual labour himself can understand the disposition and thoughts of the working classes. Söderblom's public appearances have always been characterized by his manner, which is genuinely that of the people. One has only to see him visiting in a distant parish. Who could have expected that this learned theologian, this distinguished and cultured personality, would know how to grasp, inspire, and edify his country congregation in such a simple fashion?

The other experience lay in the fact that his father was moved to the depths of his being by the great religious revival which then spread widely over the land. Deep and genuine piety characterized the life in the manse, and the future teacher of religion did not require to learn from books what is meant by a living religion.

In 1883 Söderblom went to the University of Upsala to study theology. The Faculty of Theology was not at this time in the happiest condition. The training was one in a somewhat narrow Lutheran orthodoxy, for the most part under the influence of the Erlangen School, while alongside of this the Biblicism of J. F. Beckle represented the more modern tendency. Of greater import for the growing minds of the new generation than the University Professors was a theologian not of the University, the young Pastor Primarius of Stockholm, Fredrik Fehr, who in Sweden represented the theological ideals and aims of the young Ritschlian School. He was an intimate friend of Stade. But in reality the young pupils had to find their way for themselves. This is the generation to which Nathan Söderblom belonged, which amongst us brought a really freer scientific spirit to bear on theology, and thus not only opened the

way to a new synthesis between religion and culture, but also furthered a deeper understanding of religion itself. On the heels of this theological movement there followed, during the first ten years of this century, a new awakening in the churches, which started amongst the students in Upsala. It should not be concealed that Söderblom played a very important part in this new movement, the influence of which our Church still feels every day. After severe inner struggles, the new historical conception of Biblical religion, so brilliantly presented by Wellhausen, convinced Söderblom's scientific conscience. Soon he came to see that what had at first appeared to be a danger to faith, really pointed the way to a new kingdom. God's revelation is not a book, it is not a collection of dogmas or a set of rules, but history, dealing with living people and their deeds, worked in God and through God. This discovery, indeed, did not come to him without some influence from Albrecht Ritschl. The perception that historical criticism was also of practical value for faith was one of the most important achievements of the Ritschlian theology. But Söderblom never became a mere follower of Ritschl. His intellectual activity and originality did not dispose him to become the *famulus* of a German Professor, or to enrol himself as belonging to any school. In addition to the idea of revelation as history, the emphasis laid upon the independence of religion had especially attracted Söderblom. The independence of religion is to be seen in creative religious personalities. Here Ritschl directed him to the pre-eminent religious genius of the Protestant world—to Martin Luther. The study of Luther, pursued for decades, became of the utmost importance for Söderblom's understanding of theology as a whole. *Luther's Religion* is the subject of one of his first literary efforts; twenty-five years later the religious personality of Luther is portrayed by him, with the touch of a master, in his psychological and exceedingly liberal-minded study, *Humour and Melancholy*.

Söderblom, unlike the majority of his countrymen, seemed to be born to be a cosmopolitan. It is significant that his first great interest outside his studies was the International Christian Student Mission Movement. It was thus no mere chance that he was appointed in 1894 preacher and pastor to the Swedish community in Paris, where he spent seven years of great activity. As clergyman, adviser, and helper of his countrymen in this world centre, he gained the affection of all. In the capital of the arts he cultivated the deep æsthetic interests, which also have their place in the many-

sided composition of his being. But especially was a new goal opened up for his scientific activities. Already in his closing student years his attention had been drawn to the study of Comparative Religion. His interest in the Mission played its part here just as surely as did his view of religion as the history of revelation. He had early recognized that this history must be taken as a history of the world. Moreover, Paris in the 'nineties was the centre for the study of the history of religions, with pioneers like Réville, Merillier, Maspéro, and Darmesteter. Söderblom became their disciple. For his special subject of study he chose the Iranian religion, and in 1898 he gained the title of 'Élève diplômé de l'École des hautes Études' for a thesis on *The Fravashis*. Three years later appeared his great work, long since recognized as a classic, *La Vie future d'après le Mazdéisme*, in which, indeed, starting from the beliefs of Mazdeism concerning life beyond the grave, he really gives a complete sketch of Comparative Eschatology.

The important works of Söderblom on Comparative Religion won for him in 1901 a Professorship in the Theological Faculty at the University of Upsala. As a teacher he had no equal. The enthusiasm of the young professor for his branch of study, his firm belief in the mission and future of the theological investigation, his broad-minded and intrepid recognition of every honest opinion, even though 'dangerous and proscribed'—all this came like sunshine and spring showers to a soil which had need of them. These were unforgettable years. He widened and deepened the outlook of the history of religion in the direction of psychology; he gave us a psychology of religion from the standpoint of Oriental history, which is something quite different from the products, in their own way worthy of all respect, which emanate from American laboratories. It is an individual psychology on broad historical grounds, an exceedingly sharp and fine conception of different types of Christian piety, their general characteristics and their peculiarities, of Christianity in relation to other religions, and of religion itself in its opposition to other forms of man's spiritual life. Religion interests him in the first place not as representation, mere idea, or as custom or rite, but as a form of life, as a frame of mind and a state of being, as motive power and as activity.

A notable Swedish theologian, Bishop Bodke of Lund, sees the characteristics of his investigations 'in the far-seeing survey of all sides, and in the deep respect for the actual, which forbid any premature generalizations.' These are qualities which

one in truth does not usually find together, in any case not in the History of Religion, where a reputation for constructive surveys is only too often gained through a certain carelessness in dealing with stubborn realities. But the judgment passed on Söderblom is quite correct. It is because of his grasp of history that he is able to unite the two apparently opposite qualities.

Söderblom has a keen interest in, and an extraordinary insight into, personal character. His house was a meeting-place for all earnest inquirers, not only for those recognized as promising disciples, but for the dull, the strays and free lances, whom no other understood or wished to understand. If there were genuine material, he knew how to make it ring true. Söderblom prefers to think in terms of human beings rather than of abstract ideas. Read his great work on the World Conference at Stockholm. A whole host of characters from different lands, peoples, and churches, who will achieve the task of remembering merely the names? He, however, knows not only the names, but the persons. Specially appropriate epithets are attached to the person concerned through the whole book, like the principal theme in a piece of music by Wagner.

This highly developed sense for individual peculiarities is in Söderblom, as an historian of religion, the creative thought which turns the chaos of history into a 'kosmos.' His synthesis is not the product of a dry system, it arises from his lively appreciation and keen intelligence. Thus he does not require to change reality that it may agree with his own favourite ideas. The most mature work of this characteristic synthesis of his is *Das Werden des Gottesglaubens* (1914), of which two German editions have appeared. Tylor and his successors had pronounced Animism to be the only true, original form of religion, a younger school regarded pre-Animism as having these virtues, while, for Andrew Lang and Wilhelm Schmidt, Monotheism was the original form. Söderblom shows in an essay, full of clever observations and covering nearly the whole development of religion, that each of these three hypotheses has selected an important element of primitive religion. Everywhere in the philosophy of our earliest forefathers we are confronted with the soul, mana, and the Creator in many different combinations. Each gathers round it its peculiar world of ideas, notions, and values, and it is possible to trace the passing of these primitive ideas even into the highest religions.

When comparative religious history, as is the case in Upsala, is one of the many subjects of the

Faculty of Divinity, its most important question is, What is the place of Christianity amongst religions? Naturally, the question is not answered for Söderblom by a dogmatic reference to revelation. 'The Biblical revelation must rather prove by science the validity of its special position within the genus of religions.' The worth of Christianity as the climax of religion is an historical fact, which may be grasped and proved like all other historical matters. Söderblom, however, unlike Hegel in his magnificent synthesis, does not regard Christianity simply as the climax of the whole movement, into which all religions of mankind are introduced almost anywhere as necessary stages in the dialectic of the idea of religion. From the common primitive source there proceed rather two lines of religious development. On one side the prophetic religion, which has an undeveloped embryo in the religion of Zarathustra, a side-shoot in Islam, but its chief branch in the prophets of Israel, which blossoms into Christianity. On the other side the great culture religions of India and the Western lands. Both these main developments exhibit at the same time two special types of piety, whose nature and differences are portrayed by Söderblom with genial clearness—the earnestly striving trust in God of ethical monotheism and the 'Gottesgenuss' of mystical pantheism. Söderblom appropriately calls them 'Persönlichkeitsmystik' and 'Unendlichkeitsmystik.'

The question, then, of what religion really is, Söderblom does not answer by a definition. He points to the word which gives more clearly than any other the peculiar sentiment at the basis of religion, the word 'holiness.' 'Holiness is the great word in religion; it is even more essential than the notion of God. Real religion may exist without a definite conception of Divinity, but there is no real religion without a distinction between holy and profane.' The feeling for that which is holy is the connecting link which joins into one whole the different phases of religious development, from the primitive fear of tabu to the Trisagion of the cherubim before the throne of Jahweh, from the dreadful, fear-inspiring gods to our idea of the supramundane and supranatural One. Söderblom here first gave utterance to those thoughts which later Rudolf Otto developed from his own point of view in his well-known work *Das Heilige*.

An investigation into religion which is bound by verbal revelation or church confession, which finds in Christianity at once its starting-point and its goal, is not Söderblom's ideal. But the scientific method in the study of religion, as elsewhere, does

not imply the absence of personal conviction, and, least of all, the absence of a religious viewpoint. The scientific method must be tested by its results; it depends upon scientific endowment and the love of truth. The demand that the theologian must have a sense for religion or definite theological convictions, so far as this demand is justified, comes simply to this, that he must have an acquaintance with the subject of his investigations. These conditions are pre-eminently satisfied in the case of Söderblom.

It is not necessary to say, when dealing with such a universal genius, that this form of theological outlook does not renounce acquaintance with the most important data of the spiritual life of to-day. But Söderblom's theology is fundamentally Lutheran and Swedish. It springs from a tradition which characterizes the deepest Swedish thought, the 'Persönlichkeitsphilosophie' of Geiger and Boström. The Ritschlian theology looks upon history as the work of God, as God's deeds. For Söderblom this work of God appears pre-eminently as a self-manifestation by means of great, especially chosen and equipped persons. 'God's manifestation within Humanity takes place partly through graciously favoured ones, whom our criterion, which becomes severer as time goes on, looks upon as geniuses; partly in a form of existence which in principle is accessible to every human being, that of moral freedom.' This is illustrated most clearly and powerfully in the case of the few who inside the realm of moral freedom itself have come forward as innovators. One might name Moses, Socrates, Laotse, the Prophets, Paul, Plotinus, Luther, and Kant. But undeniably there is no rival to Jesus, even if one leaves out of sight, for the moment, His incomparable significance for the history of the world. He has no possible rival from the point of view of creative power and ethical independence.

Is Jesus, then, to be regarded simply as one of the great creative geniuses of Humanity? It would be to grossly misunderstand the whole manner and tendency of Söderblom's thinking, to find in the above utterances a mere echo of the liberal theology. He has never been able to accept the picture of Jesus drawn by the liberal school of religious history. He knows of no difference between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith. The mission as Messiah, the Last Supper, the Resurrection, cannot for him be separated from the rest of the history, through which God speaks to us; these are rather the essential parts of the whole. It is significant, to call attention to a single detail, that, while

liberal theology accepts it as a matter of course that every truthful description of Jesus must be confined to the Synoptic Gospels, Söderblom has never been able to give up the picture of Jesus in the Gospel of St. John. In a recent publication he has expressed the opinion that at least in the main that picture is by an eye-witness.

This Revelation theology is very different from an æsthetic or evolutionary religion of Humanity. It is not by their richly endowed nature, or by their brilliant superiority over other men, but rather by faithfulness to their calling and earnest activity that geniuses become revealers of God. This 'personal revelation' attains perfection in the moral emancipation of a man through forgiveness of sins and trust in God. That is the characteristic of Lutheranism. Freedom is the central idea of this theology: 'The truth shall make you free'—its oft-repeated watchword. Trust brings freedom, freedom of thought and of speech, but also freedom to live from the spiritual riches which the order and confession of the Church supply. It is not the freedom of self-will, but the freedom of being able to follow 'the alone liberating and saving compulsion of duty.'

In 1912 Söderblom accepted a call to Leipzig to occupy the newly founded Chair of the History of Religion. He had scarcely been at work there two years when, after election, he was appointed Archbishop of Upsala. The connexion which Schleiermacher had called for between theology and Church government characterized in the highest degree the theology of the Swedish universities. The professors were at that time holders of Church livings, and are still members of the ecclesiastical courts. But, above all, they had exercised since olden times a decided influence over the spiritual guidance of the Church. A natural consequence is that the Bishops are mostly chosen from amongst them.

The churches of Sweden had certainly passed through a period of depression during the last ten years of the preceding century. The great religious movements amongst the people in the 'sixties and 'seventies had led to the institution of numerous Free Churches, which indeed, for the most part, belonged formally to the Church, but as a matter of fact occupied a position of distinct opposition to it. Even in Church circles many silently cherished grave doubts about the future of the Church. The very servants of the Church did not hesitate to proclaim their free 'evangelical' opinion by passing a depreciating judgment upon it. Söderblom early showed himself an earnest champion of the Church

of the people. Its worth for him, however, did not depend upon its being the Church of authority, stable order, and rigid creed, but upon its being the Church of true evangelical freedom. 'Two fundamental principles, never quite reconcilable, inspire advanced religion in general, and Christianity in particular. One is the personal resolve of the individual. A choice is dictated between God and the world. This personal decision is the root of the Free Church conception. Congregations of that kind have their function, live their life, and take refuge sooner or later in the fold, which from a deeper point of view they never forsook. . . . The other fundamental principle is the work of God, His grace past finding out. If any form of the Church can symbolize this side of Christianity, it is the State Church. She defines no limits for her faith in Almighty God, and for her duty of caring for souls; she is only bounded by the State and its language. She desires naught else than to win her way to souls with the message of the forgiveness of sins.'

The Church of Sweden has preserved the ancient Catholic tradition in her order and her ritual to a far greater degree than most other Protestant State Churches. This fidelity in the administration of the common Christian heritage has as its natural expression the fact that with us the Apostolic Succession has *demonstrably* persisted unbroken. Söderblom has always very highly prized the connexion with Christendom in general, past and present, to which this tradition bears testimony. He has always felt strongly the spiritual affinity between our Church and the Church of England on this point, and has made great efforts to bring about a spiritual and personal exchange between the two Churches. But attachment to this Church tradition does in no wise appear to him to be an indispensable condition of a true Christian life.

Nathan Söderblom is still in the midst of his Church activities. The judgment of what his Episcopate has meant for our Church is a question for future investigation. But even now it may be stated without fear of contradiction that during his time the position of the Church in Sweden has been strengthened to a remarkable degree. That his large-hearted, enthusiastic, and energetic directing of the Church has had a large share in this result will scarcely be disputed. He, the restless worker, understands, as no one else, how to infuse new zeal into the daily work of Christian service. At a Church diet a priest complained bitterly about the crushing burden of work in large congregations: 'We are working ourselves to death.' The Arch-

bishop instantly replied: 'But that is the very thing we should do. A priest *should* work himself to death. But—slowly and in an intelligent fashion.' 'Be concerned about the souls, be not concerned about yourself! Spare the souls, spare not yourself!'—these are words of admonition which he addresses to young ordinands from before the altar. The influence and the recognition which the superior spiritual personality of the Archbishop has won even from the most unwilling redounds to the benefit of the Church. It cannot be concealed that his person has gained a certain importance in the Christian world. His word is listened to with respect in wide circles. In difficult questions of Church politics his intervention is asked for in distant lands, people seek to make use of his influence in matters of every description. The Evangelical Churches of the New Baltic states invite him to the consecration of their bishops. His tour in America amongst the two million Swedes who live scattered there was a real triumphal march, and tightened still more closely the bonds with the homeland in innumerable hearts. Much may still be hoped for from the Church which is under the guidance of this man.

It was a number of men inspired by Christian sentiments who at Constance in the end of July 1914 originated 'the World Alliance for International Agreement by Means of the Church.' Never could the work of Christian unification have begun under more mournful auspices. The Archbishop of Upsala was not at that time amongst them. But he has devoted his whole soul to the idea of restoring Christian fellowship which was destroyed by the War. Already in the autumn of 1914 he had drawn up an appeal 'for peace and Christian fellowship,' which was signed by representatives of the Churches of neutral countries. Since then he has been unceasingly busied with those efforts which finally led to the Christian World Conference at Stockholm in 1925. If ever a man was endowed and prepared by Providence to play a leading part in this 'œcumenical' work, that man was Nathan Söderblom. He had studied science in France, had worked as a Professor in Germany, and was attached to the English Church by bonds of warmest concord. A very uncommon faculty of being able to feel with others had enabled him to make friends amongst the leading representatives of the Church and of Religion. He knew, as few of his contemporaries did, and from his

own personal experience, the spiritual position of Evangelical Christianity in different countries. And yet it can scarcely be said that it was the desire of such a cosmopolitan to see international relations again established, that urged him on in his work for unification. Already early in life as a young student he had listened with an awakened conscience to the bitter complaint of the masses, who accused the Church of viewing with indifference the pressing social needs of mankind. Now he heard again the same complaint coupled with the more terrible accusation that the War had spelt bankruptcy to Christianity. The Church had not been able to prevent the selfishness, the discord and the frenzied hatred, because it had not honestly wished to do so. Christian love had become an empty word. The accusation weighed heavily upon his Christian conscience. It left him no peace.

From his theology as from his whole nature it is self-evident that he would not desire a union of the Churches which meant the renouncing of confessional differences. As a matter of fact, the spiritual individuality of different Churches is for him the gift of God granted to each; it indicates the vocation of each Church, and marks out the special direction in which it is to exploit the riches of Christian life. This does not mean, however, that for real unity he does not clearly recognize the necessity of a common Christian faith. But a real unity of faith can never be attained through decrees of Councils, but only through free spiritual intercourse, which will best be promoted by a common endeavour after a practical Christianity.

Söderblom might well regard the movement for Christian unity as the principal task of his life. He has devoted all the resources in his power to this task. In the difficult years during which preparations for the Conference were being made, when difficulties arose in almost incredible fashion, when time after time the whole structure threatened to collapse, his courage never wavered, his faith never despaired. He was like one assured that he was charged with a mission from God.

How far the influence of the Stockholm Conference will extend in the future, no one knows. Still an effort has been made, and that is itself a great thing. Amongst those concerned with this bold endeavour Nathan Söderblom has inscribed his name for the future in the history of the Christian Church.

Altars and Sanctuaries in the Old Testament.

BY THE REVEREND CANON J. BATTERSBY HARFORD, M.A., B.D., RIPON.

II.

A. The Historical and Prophetical Books (contd.).

III. THE third historical period is the Exile and after, as seen in Ezekiel, the post-exilic prophets, Ezra and Nehemiah, together with the sidelight cast by Chronicles.

1. *Sanctuaries*.—The Exile completed the work of reformation. The complete break with the past made it possible for a new generation to abandon the high places for ever, and to return, a religious rather than a political body, centring round Jerusalem. To them the one God could only have one place of worship. The second Temple stood without a rival. The word 'sanctuary' (*mikdash*) now comes to be used exclusively of the Temple (see Art. I. p. 13).

²[It is used twenty-four times of the second Temple, twenty-three times of the first, and five times³ (where the exact reference is not quite clear) in the Psalms; twenty-nine uses are in Ezekiel, two in late prophecies in Jeremiah, two in Isaiah, eight in Chronicles and Nehemiah, three in Lamentations, three in Daniel, five in the Psalms. In Ezk 21² (⁷ in Heb. text) the parallelism with Jerusalem indicates that 'sanctuaries' means the sacred buildings which covered the Temple area.]

Any idea of a sanctuary other than that at Jerusalem seems to have vanished from the mind of Ezekiel and his successors.

2. *Altars*.—In the second Temple there were eventually two altars (1 Mac 1²¹ 4⁴⁷⁻⁵⁰)—the altar of burnt-offering and the altar of incense. But Ezekiel speaks only of 'the altar' (of brass) in the Temple court and of an altar or table within the Temple, *i.e.* the shewbread table.

[In chap. 6⁸ 'altars' are altars of the high places. In 8^{5, 16} 9², dealing with the first Temple, he speaks simply of 'the altar'—once 'the altar of brass.' In the vision of the future Temple (40⁴⁶⁻⁴⁷) he speaks ten times of 'the altar' which would stand in the Temple court, and once he calls the shewbread table 'the altar,' says that it was of wood, and explains: 'This is the table that is before Jehovah' (cf. Mal 1⁷).] Even in Ezr 3^{2, 3} and Neh 10³⁴ the altar in the court is still called simply 'the altar.' But when we come to Chronicles (the last book in the Hebrew Bible), while in some

passages we find the earlier usage, in others we find the altar in the court called 'the altar of burnt-offering,' and a second altar appears, called 'the altar of incense' (1 Ch 28¹⁸, 2 Ch 4¹⁹ 26^{16, 19}). These two altars are said (1 Ch 6⁴⁰ (34 in Heb. text)) to have existed in the tabernacle, and the duty of officiating at both was reserved to 'Aaron and his sons.'

[A 'golden altar' is mentioned in the present text of 1 K 6²⁰⁻²² and 7⁴⁸, but the altar of cedar overlaid with gold in 6²⁰ is clearly the shewbread table, as in Ezekiel and Malachi, while the other two verses bear all the marks of interpolation from the parallel account in Chronicles.] If there were two altars in Solomon's Temple from the first, the silence of the earlier historical books and of Ezekiel seems inexplicable. Even 2 Ch 29¹⁸, following perhaps an earlier source, speaks only of 'the altar of burnt-offering' and 'the table of shewbread.'

3. *Sacrifices*.—Ezekiel has been called 'the priest in the prophet's mantle.' In his picture of the future (40-48) the Temple and its ritual hold central place. The first Temple was in ruins, its worship had ceased. If the tradition was not to be lost, past practice must be written down, with such modifications as would secure greater reverence in the future. In Ezekiel and in Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, we find a great development of animal sacrifice. The ancient practice, as we have seen (A, I. 3), knew only two regular kinds. Probably at that time only thank-offerings were offered in ordinary life, burnt-offerings being the outcome of some special emergency or in connexion with great public occasions. But from the time that slaughter of domestic animals for food becomes divorced from sacrifice (see Dt 12¹³⁻²⁷ and Art. 6) the altar becomes pre-eminently 'the altar of burnt-offering.' Thank-offerings pass into the background, and offerings wholly given to God take the leading place (see *e.g.* Ezr 3²⁻⁶). The *minhah* ('gift' or 'oblation,' A, I. 3) comes more and more to have the specific meaning of grain-offering (Ezk 42¹³ and fourteen times, etc.). Ezekiel also uses a new name for a sacrificial gift to God, namely, 'Korban' (20²⁸ 40⁴³ R.V. 'offering' and 'oblation'), which is familiar to us from its use in the Gospel according to St. Mark (7¹¹). Moreover, new varieties of

offerings appear first in Ezekiel, and recur in Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah. These are the sin- and guilt- (trespass) offerings. They probably came into use in the century previous to the Exile, as Ezekiel assumes that their nature is known.

Further, during this last period there comes in the offering of incense. The older historical and prophetic literature makes no reference to the offering of incense. The earliest passage is Jer 6²⁰, which declares frankincense (לְבָנָה) and sweet cane to be unacceptable to Jehovah.

[There are other eleven uses of *l'bōnah*, all in the later literature (see B, III. 3 below). The word usually translated incense (קְטֹרֶת) occurs fifteen times outside the Pentateuch. It means literally 'sweet smoke.' In Pr 27⁹ it is used of perfume (cf. Ca 3⁶ 'perfumed'). In three passages certainly—probably in five—it is the smoke arising from sacrificial burning on the altar. So Ps 66¹⁵ (the *ḥfōreth* of rams is parallel to burnt-offerings of fatlings), Is 1¹³ (note parallel and context), and Ps 141² (parallel to evening oblation); probably also 2 Ch 29⁷ (note parallel and the silence of vv. 18, 31-35 as to any altar of incense or any burning of incense in the cleansed Temple), and even the late passage, 1 S 2²⁸ (note context and parallel). In Ezekiel (8¹¹ 16¹⁸ 23⁴¹) we come upon the first clear instances of *ḥfōreth* as meaning incense of spices, and Chronicles provides us with six more (1 Ch 6⁴⁹ 28¹⁸, 2 Ch 2⁴ 13¹¹ 26^{18, 19}). The use of the cognate verb 'to cause to smoke' is on the same lines. Unfortunately the R.V., following the A.V., has regularly translated it, when used absolutely, 'burn incense.' And yet a careful study of the sixty uses of the verb absolutely, and of the twelve

cases in which an object is expressed, leads to the conviction that fifty-four of the former and nine or ten of the latter refer to 'sacrificial smoke' and not to 'incense proper.' Chronicles alone gives clear uses of the verb in the latter sense (1 Ch 6⁴⁹, 2 Ch 2⁴, 6 13¹¹ 26^{18, 19}.)]

4. Lastly, in this third period we find significant change in the ministry at the altar. In Ezekiel 40-48, for the first time in the authentic history of Israel, we come upon two Orders of ministrants. 'The sons of Levi' (40⁴⁶) are henceforth to be divided into two bodies (44⁶⁻¹⁶): (i) the Levitical priests of Jerusalem (vv. 15, 16), who claimed descent from Zadok, are alone to be priests in the future Temple; (ii) the former priests of the country sanctuaries (vv. 10-14) are to be degraded, because of their idolatrous practices. Under the distinctive name of Levites they are henceforth to perform those inferior duties in the Temple which had in the past been performed by uncircumcised aliens (vv. 6-9). This was probably only stereotyping what had already begun to be customary after Josiah's reformation. And when we turn to Ezra and Nehemiah we find the two Orders actually ministering in the second Temple on the lines laid down by Ezekiel. Moreover, when the same writer retells the story of the past in Chronicles, he pictures the ministry of the first Temple as organized on similar lines. In these three books, which were originally one, 'the Levites' are mentioned one hundred and sixty-one times and the priests one hundred and seventy-five times. This is clearly regarded as the normal and only legal state of things. The result of the above historical survey may be summarized in a table:

Period.	Altars.	Sanctuaries.	Sacrifices.	Ministrants.
I.	Many	Numerous	Two main types	Laymen and priest (no sharp division).
II.	One	One	Two main types	Levite priests.
III.	One	One	Five types	(Priests (Zadokite). (Levites (inferior Order).

B. The Pentateuch.

We now turn to the Pentateuch and study the statements with regard to worship set forth in narrative and legislation in the three main literary strata which have been found to exist side by side

within it. There are marked differences between the three in outlook and in law, and each one of the three corresponds in these respects with one of the three historical periods.

I. The extant remains of the document known as JE.—This is a composite document formed by com-

binning two earlier documents, one Judaic and one Ephraimitic. The book of the Covenant lays down (Ex 20²⁴⁻²⁶) that, when an Israelite wants to sacrifice, he shall make unto Jehovah an altar of earth and shall sacrifice thereon his burnt-offerings and his peace-offerings, his sheep and his oxen. If the altar is made of stone, it shall be of unhewn stone; to lift up a tool upon it is to pollute it. In any case it must not be approached by steps for seemliness' sake. The accompanying promise, 'In every place where I cause my name to be remembered I will come unto thee and will bless thee,' points to a multiplicity of altars. No restriction is made as to who shall minister at the altar. The offerer is apparently himself to be the ministrant, in accordance, no doubt, with ancient custom.

[On 'the house of Jehovah' (Ex 23¹⁹, etc.) see Article 4.]

As with the Law in JE, so with the narrative. In Genesis the patriarchs erect altars wherever they settle, and offer their own sacrifices, and these places are the very places which in the history are noted as famous holy places. 'As a rule, a Divine appearance calls attention to, or afterwards confirms, the holiness of the place' (see Art. 5, III. 1, iv). Thus the highest sanction is given to the worship which obtained at these holy places in the first centuries of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. All that seemed offensive at a later period, when Jerusalem was regarded as the only legitimate centre for worship, is in JE consecrated and countenanced by Jehovah Himself and by the acts of Jehovah's favoured friends, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—high places, local altars and sacrifices, memorial pillars, sacred trees and wells. The correspondence between all this and the features of the worship of the Israelites in both kingdoms before King Josiah's centralization is too obvious to need elaboration.

II. DEUTERONOMY.¹—It is impossible to avoid seeing the correspondence between this book and the record of the reformation of Josiah. Almost every feature which appears in 2 K 23 can be paralleled in Deuteronomy. Here, especially in chap. 12, we find insistence upon unity of worship at one centre. It is important to remember that the standpoint (whether real or assumed) is that of Moses in Moab before the entrance into Canaan, and the language is therefore normally in accordance with that standpoint. If, therefore, the writer was really writing in the days of (say) Hezekiah or Manasseh, and he wished to urge the destruction of the high places, because of the degeneracy of

the worship of Jehovah as carried on in them in his own day, he had to speak of them as they would appear by anticipation from Moses' standpoint. Moses would naturally have thought of them as the sites of worship of the Canaanite Baals. Keeping this in mind and turning to Dt 12²⁻⁷, we realize the significance of the command—(i) to destroy all the sacred 'places' of the Canaanites 'upon the high mountains and upon the hills and under every green tree' (= Jer 2²⁰ 3^{6, 13}), to break down their altars and dash in pieces their pillars and burn their sacred poles and hew down their carved images, and then (ii) to resort to 'the place which Jehovah your God shall choose out of all your tribes,' and thither to bring all their sacrifices and offerings and there to eat with joy before Jehovah. The word 'high place' is not used in Deuteronomy; the writer uses instead the word 'place.' An elaborate list of offerings is given in 12⁶, but nothing is said about sin- or guilt-offerings. The thought of joyousness is still prominent.

[The word 'altar' is rare in Deuteronomy. It is used twice (7⁵ 12³) of altars which are to be thrown down, three times (27⁵⁻⁷) of the altar of unhewn stone on Mount Ebal, three times (12²⁷ and 26⁴) of the altar of Jehovah at the place of His choice, and once (16^{21, 22}) in a prohibition of pillar or pole before the altar of Jehovah, which seems to belong to an earlier date than chap. 12⁴.]

As to ministry, there is only one Order, 'the Levite priests' (17⁹⁻¹⁶, etc.); gulf between Levites and priests there is none (Dt 10⁸, etc.).²

Dt 18⁶⁻⁸ looks as if it was intended to provide that country priests, when their local high places were thrown down, should be admitted to serve as priests at the Temple in Jerusalem. If so, it failed in its purpose (see 2 K 23⁹).

Deuteronomy thus bears manifest marks of being later than JE, and to present those ideas which came into force in the days of Josiah.

III. THE PRIESTLY CODE.³—In this code we find: 1. a central sanctuary, the Tabernacle (lit. the dwelling), where alone legitimate sacrifice can be offered. It is framed on the same lines as the two Temples, with outer court, Holy Place, and Holy of holies.

[*Mishkān* is used of God's 'dwelling' outside the Pentateuch in a non-technical sense, once in the first period in 2 S 7⁶, cf. 1 Ch 17⁵ (Jos 22^{19, 20} are

² For complete list of phrases used, see *Since Wellhausen*, p. 123 note.

³ For the literary analysis of this, see *Since Wellhausen*, art. 5, pp. 118 ff.

¹ For literary criticism, see *Since Wellhausen*, art. 4.

in a post-exilic passage), once in Ezk 37²⁷ (cf. v. 26) and seven times in the Psalms (once of Shiloh and six times of the Temple, five of these in the plural); eight times it is used in the technical sense of 'the Tabernacle' (six being in Chronicles and two in Joshua). In the Pentateuch it is not once used in JE or D, though Deuteronomy uses the cognate verb ('dwell') in 12²¹, etc. But in P it is used of the Tabernacle ninety-nine times.]

This 'dwelling' is twelve times in P called 'the sanctuary,' just as in Ezekiel and later writings the Temples are so called (see A, III. 1).

2. This sanctuary contains in the court an altar of burnt-offering, and (in a late supplement, Ex 30¹⁻⁷. Note 29⁴³⁻⁴⁶, bringing the account of the Tabernacle to a conclusion, 27¹ 'the altar,' etc., and the 'censers' in Lv 10 and Nu 16, cf. Ezk 8¹¹) an altar of incense before the veil (see A, III. 2).

3. Upon the altar of burnt-offering are 'made to smoke' (R.V. 'burn,' twenty-seven times, Ex 29¹³, etc.) the burnt-offerings and 'the fat' of the other sacrifices. The sin-offering (ninety-eight times) and the guilt-offering (twenty-eight times) and the Day of Atonement now appear in the Law and are given prominence. The word *korban*, used as in Ezekiel, is found in the Hebrew seventy-five times. It is generally translated 'oblation' in R.V. as Lv 1^{2, 3}, etc. The *minḥah* is now exclusively the 'meal-offering' (Lv 2, 3, etc), and is accompanied by frankincense (*p'bonah*, Lv 2¹ and ten times). To burn incense morning and evening is the exclusive privilege of Aaron (Ex 30⁷⁻⁸) and his descendants, and on the Day of Atonement it is given a very conspicuous place in the ritual, and is offered by the high priest himself (Lv 16¹²⁻¹³) in a censer (see A, III. 3).

4. Finally, the ministrants within and without the Tabernacle are sharply divided. Aaron and his sons are consecrated to be priests, performing all the service within the Tabernacle and blessing the people (Ex 28-29). The tribe of Levi are then given to Aaron (Nu 3⁵⁻⁴, 24⁷⁻⁵³). They carry the Tabernacle and its holy contents when on journeys, and camp around it when at rest. When going on journeys the holy things must be covered up by the priests before the Levites enter to carry them out. Instead of having no portion or inheritance, they are given the tithe and forty-eight cities (and in Jos 21 a priestly writer records the fulfilment of this command). Ezekiel sketched out a different provision (45¹⁻⁵ 48⁸⁻¹⁴) (see A, III. 4).

Here, in P, we have a remarkable correspondence with the phraseology, ritual, and practice of the

repatriated community in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah.

C. Conclusion.

Looking back now over the whole range of our study, we cannot fail to be struck by the correspondence between JE, D, and P, when placed in that order, on the one hand, and the actual development of worship, as we have traced it, in history and prophecy on the other. As long as we retain the conception of the Pentateuchal Law as given in its present order, and completed before the entrance into Canaan, so long we are faced by three extremely puzzling facts:

i. The fact that there are immense differences of outlook and of legislative requirements in JE, D, and P themselves.

ii. The fact that D is blankly ignorant of the Tabernacle and of its most significant ritual and ministry, which *ex hypothesi* had been solemnly promulgated as ordinances for ever by Moses himself only a few years before.

iii. The fact that, according to this arrangement, at the beginning and at the end of the Biblical history of Israel, two sharply contrasted Orders of Priests and Levites are represented as ministering in the sanctuary, while during the intervening period, lasting many centuries, this ordering, introduced under the most solemn sanctions, is ignored by everybody.

The puzzle disappears as soon as we accept the solution, which Wellhausen presented with such convincing force:

- (i) that JE is the earliest of the three strata;
- (ii) that D is the result of the prophetic teaching of Amos, Hosea, Micah, and Isaiah, and answers, in part at least, to 'the book of the Covenant' of Josiah; and
- (iii) that P's picture of the Mosaic theocracy is a reflection back into the distant past of the threefold ministry as it existed in the writer's own day (say 500 B.C.).

This 'relieves the religious leaders of the nation in the past from the charge of wilful neglect of the Mosaic Ordinances, and presents P, not as the foundation, but as the headstone, of the Pentateuch.'¹

It may seem at first sight a loss that the high ideals of the Tabernacle should not be traceable back to the time of Moses, but (i) if the later date be the true one, it is the date which in the counsel of God was the most suitable and therefore the best.

¹ See *Since Wellhausen*, p. 127.

(ii) It is in accordance with God's order both in nature and grace that the more simple should come first and the more elaborate at a later stage.

(iii) Whatever be the date, the Tabernacle and the worship of the second Temple set forth the same lesson of the holiness of God and the reverence with which men should draw near to worship Him. The Day of Atonement still foreshadows the way by which the Divine High Priest was one day to 'enter in once for all

into the holy place,' having obtained eternal redemption.'

If it is because they believe that such spiritual teachings as these are done away with by the 'Wellhausen theory,' that so many devout Christians still cling desperately to the traditional view, then may not one hope that a truer understanding of the position will lead them to recognize that it is only historical questions of date and authorship which are in question, and that the truths they cherish are not in danger?

Literature.

A THEOLOGY FOR LAYMEN.

WELCOME signs are appearing on every hand of a revival of interest in Christian doctrine. The bold assertion that it does not matter what a man believes so long as he lives right, is less frequently heard. It is beginning to be seen—though it was always plain enough to those who had eyes to see—that belief and conduct are not to be separated. The attempt to carry on with a creedless Christianity is manifestly a failure, and many who had drifted away from a positive creed are again seeking for some sure anchorage of faith.

In these circumstances we note with the greatest pleasure the appearance of an extremely able and timely book, *Beliefs that Matter*, by the Rev. W. Adams Brown, Ph.D., D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net). Dr. Adams Brown made a name for himself in the theological world years ago by his 'Christian Theology in Outline,' and it is not too much to say that the present volume will enhance his reputation. He has been a close and penetrating observer of the trend of thought in our day. 'The generation that is drawing to a close has been trying on an unprecedented scale the experiment of a creedless religion.' Now there are signs that the tide is on the turn. 'In many quarters we find evidences of a reviving interest in questions of belief. In the church this appears in movements like Fundamentalism and Anglo-Catholicism, which emphasize the importance of right thinking in religion. Outside the Church it appears in the increased market for books which deal with the more serious aspects of religion. Theology, it appears, is coming to its own again.' To meet this situation Dr. Adams Brown has written his book.

It is 'neither a history of belief nor an apology for believing. It is a statement as plain as I can make it of what one modern Christian believes may be a practicable faith for the men and women of to-day.'

It would be quite impossible to give an adequate idea of the richness and variety of its contents, for it travels over the whole field of belief. After an introductory chapter on Why Religion cannot Dispense with Belief, there follow chapters on What to Believe about Oneself, about the World we live in, about Jesus, about the Cross, about God, about the Church, about the Bible, about the Sacrament, and about Immortality. These are immense topics to be treated in a volume of three hundred pages, yet they are handled in a masterly way without leaving any sense of omissions or undue compression. The sub-title of the book is 'A Theology for Laymen,' and nothing could be more admirable as a guide to any intelligent inquirer. Preachers will find in it inspiration for many sermons, and if they could embody its leading ideas in a course of lectures, systematic theology might begin to shine out again after its long eclipse. At the end of the book there is a carefully selected bibliography and an excellent index.

THE ETHIC OF JESUS.

Books on 'Christian Ethics' have not, in general, been impressive performances. A blight seems to fall on any one who begins to expound this theme—why, it is difficult to say. Even Martensen is not beyond a suspicion of dullness. A straight book on ethics can be very fascinating; witness Professor Laird's 'Study in Moral Theory.' On the

other hand, it makes all one's bones ache to recall the weary pages of Dr. Such-and-such on the Christian brand of the same affair. It is therefore a real pleasure to praise a book on this theme that has both distinction and sound thinking: *Christ, the Wisdom of Man: A Study of Jesus as an Ethical Teacher*, by the Rev. A. Boyd Scott, M.C., D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 15s. net). Part of the enjoyment is derived from the style. It is perhaps a trifle 'precious,' and there is a tendency to overwork phrases like 'our engagement with a theme.' But apart from these little blemishes, the style is as unlike that of a heavy treatise as one would wish. Dr. Scott has produced not only a piece of philosophy, but a piece of real literature. And one of the charms of his writing is the frequently unexpected use of words, as when he calls T. H. Green 'that great and advantageous philosopher.' All the more regrettable, therefore, is it that the 'jacket' of his book should be disfigured by the sentence: 'The crucial controversies of the day centre round the ethics of Jesus.' If a forward 'centred round' the goal he would not long remain a forward! But he would not, of course, even attempt so absurd a feat.

The real task of a reviewer is to give a picture of a book, to let the reader see what is in it. And this is easy in the present case because of the orderly progression of the writer's thought. He begins, naturally, with the Personality of Jesus and the validity of the records of His words and deeds. It is one of the merits of this study that you find in it, not the 'meek and mild' Jesus of tradition, but the real, regal, august Jesus of the Gospels. The pages in which we read an analysis of the impression St. Mark leaves on a candid reader are very fine as well as very convincing. The section on the teaching of Jesus seems to us to be the slightest and least impressive in the book.

But the author gets into his stride when he proceeds to the comparison of Jesus with other great ethical teachers. Here we have the field divided between the moral standard as Law, as Happiness, and as Perfection. Under the first head we have Butler and Kant. Under the second we have Eudæmonism. Under the third we have T. H. Green, Croce, Bergson, Simmel, and Nietzsche. And none of these in any casual way either. The several systems are carefully and fully expounded. And the reader will be impressed by the author's wide reading, by his mastery of the authors he discusses, and by the extraordinary insight and sympathy that enable him to find deep and lasting

truth in all, and points of contact with the Master in all.

The original contribution in this book, however, comes at the close. Dr. Scott discusses the theory that ethics can stand on its own bottom, and rightly rejects it. But he does not accept the position that the root of ethics is religion. What that root is we find it difficult to say. Dr. Scott calls it 'piety,' and this word he reserves for an attitude towards the universe that expresses itself in religion, ethics, art, and thought. It is something deeper than religion, if we apprehend the matter at all rightly. Jesus had it in perfection. It was this mystic, poetic, childlike openness to Reality that was the 'secret' of Jesus. It is the secret of all achievement in the realm of the spiritual and æsthetic and even scientific. The chapters in which this idea is expounded are extraordinarily interesting, and perhaps with a re-reading would yield more. And they are very well worth consideration. We can say the same of the book as a whole.

ATTACK ON MODERNISM.

If anything were necessary to convince one of the sheer impossibility of the attitude to the Bible which is being rapidly superseded by the modern critical approach, it would be such a book as that of the Rev. T. J. McCrossan, B.A., B.D., on *The Bible: Christ and Modernism* (The Covenant Publishing Company; 3s. 6d. net). It is written, like all such books, with the best of motives—to steady and instruct all who are being 'misled' by 'those who would overturn the faith of the historic Church.' But the antiquated apologetic presented by this book is much more likely to produce sceptics than believers.

What are we to make of a writer who argues that 'the Bible is God's own Book because it contains great scientific truths unknown to all mankind until hundreds of years later,' and in defence of this contention argues thus?—'In Job xxxviii. 35, *we read*, "Canst thou send out lightnings, that they may go, and say unto thee, Here we are?" All down the ages infidels have laughed at these words; the idea of sending messages by lightning. But this is the only word the Hebrews had for electricity, so, in this age of radio messages, we realize that Job xxxviii. 35 is a very scientific statement, for to-day we can send forth messages by lightnings, or electricity. This is only another proof that the Bible is far in advance of all modern science.' Or what are we to make of a writer who infers from

Job 38^{22f}. (which he assigns to 1500 B.C.!), that 'the Bible knew all about our very latest explosive, T.N.T.'? A sense of humour and a sense of poetry would preserve a writer from such banalities.

Not content with regarding prophecy as prediction, the writer must represent the Psalms as predicting. But where is the warrant for asserting that Ps 31⁶ predicts that *Christ* would cry out, 'Into thine hand I commit my spirit'? May the psalmist not be allowed to express *his own* faith? All the objections of the critics to the Book of Daniel, which is 'most authentic prophecy,' are, we are blandly assured, 'puerile nonsense.' In answer to the question, 'How can we possibly be happy in Heaven when we know that some of our loved ones are suffering eternal agony in Hell?' we are told that the Bible seems to the writer to teach clearly that God will yet cause those in Heaven to utterly forget that their sinful loved ones ever lived, one of the proofs being Ps 69²⁸. One of the chapters is designed to prove that the Bible estimates modernists as (a) intellectual fools, (b) blinded by Satan, (c) cursed of God, (d) lost souls, and that Christians should (1) beware of them and (2) have no fellowship with them. If this were all that the apologetic of the twentieth century had to offer, the outlook for reasonable religion would be black indeed.

WESLEY'S LEGACY.

It is an evidence of the real greatness of John Wesley and the vitality of Methodism that interest in the man and his work continues to increase with the years. In *Wesley's Legacy to the World* (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), Mr. J. Ernest Rattenbury has made a notable addition to the literature of the subject. He has not written a life of Wesley, nor a history of Methodism. After the recent monumental work of Dr. Simon that is unnecessary. His book is what it professes to be, an estimate of Wesley's place in history and his influence upon the life of England and of the world. Mr. Rattenbury shows an easy mastery of his subject, and he makes effective use of the writings of two distinguished foreigners, Dr. Elie Halévy, and le Père Piette. His attitude is that of an enthusiastic Methodist, with perhaps an undue sense of the importance of Methodism as when he envisages Rome and Epworth in rivalry for the throne of Christendom. But his work is by no means uncritical, and his judgments are eminently sane and supported by weighty evidences.

It is a living picture of Wesley that he sets before

us; in his wonderful union of the evangelical with the high churchman, the mystic with the man of common sense. In illustration of the doctrines and history of Methodism very full and illuminating use is made of Charles Wesley's hymns. A large and important section of the book is given to a discussion of the Wesleyan influence on religion and on social service. In regard to the former, Mr. Rattenbury argues that both the Salvation Army and the Anglo-Catholic movement 'derive, the one directly and the other at least partially, from the Evangelical Revival.' In Wesley's religious experience the sacramentarian or high church element was blended with the evangelical, and continued in undiminished intensity to the end. 'It is quite possible that we should have been spared the Romanizing of the Church of England to-day if Methodists had been faithful to the sacramental as well as the evangelical elements of the Revival of the eighteenth century.'

On the side of social service Mr. Rattenbury vigorously defends Methodism from the charge of indifference to the material welfare of the people. 'While it is not suggested that Wesley's primary concern was the social condition of England, it is asserted that his conscience was always alive to the needs of human beings, and that the idea that the early Methodists were so immersed in introspection and raptures that they had no time to discharge their social duties is so obviously mistaken that it is high time that serious social writers correct, and do not reiterate, the ignorant prejudices of misguided radicals of the early nineteenth century.'

JESUS AND THE HUMAN CONFLICT.

In *Jesus and the Human Conflict* (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net), the Rev. John Dow, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in Emmanuel College, Toronto, offers a study of the Historic Jesus and His gospel. The work is based on the Cunningham Lectures delivered by the author some years ago in New College, Edinburgh. The burden of it is thus expressed: 'Calvary did not merely decide the issue of a single combat; it was the culminating point of the universal human conflict persisted in by faith of man through mists of tears and tempests of doubt, generation after generation.' This is undoubtedly true, from the standpoint of the Christian interpretation of history.

Studies of Israel's struggle towards the understanding of the religious meaning of life, and of the significance of John the Baptist, lead to the studies

in the life and teaching of Jesus which form the major portion of the book. The first need in the human conflict is represented as a sure faith in God as Father, the second as reverence for God's spiritual nature and the patient ways of the Spirit, and the third as the meeting of evil by suffering love. Distrust, despair, and self-love are the universal human weaknesses. Over against them we must set faith, hope, and charity.

The whole volume is rich in expository material, and is written in a style that is always strong and arresting, and sometimes becomes truly eloquent.

MARSILIUS OF PADUA.

Mr. C. W. Previt -Orton, M.A., Librarian of St. John's College, Cambridge, has issued a critical edition, based on the MSS, of Marsilius of Padua's *Defensor Pacis* (Cambridge University Press; 35s. net). Until now the text printed in the *Editio Princeps* of 1522 had never been revised.

Marsilius of Padua was probably born between 1275 and 1280. He practised medicine in Padua, and was also for a time Rector of the University of Paris. Converted to Ghibellinism, he conceived and wrote his *Defensor Pacis*, which was finished on 24th June 1324. Taking refuge thereafter in Germany, he accompanied Lewis IV. to Rome, and inspired the revolutionary proceedings there, which seem to have been 'a doctrinaire attempt to translate the theories of the *Defensor* into action.' In his later years he seems to have lived in Bavaria, under the protection of Lewis, as a physician and counsellor. He died in or before 1343.

The *Defensor Pacis* is first and foremost an attempt to destroy the papal supremacy as conceived by such a Pope as Boniface VIII. and the whole structure of ecclesiastical jurisdiction as set forth in the Canon Law. It shows that no special Divine revelation created the papal supremacy and independent ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and also that the very nature of the perfect community of the State excluded them as incompatible with its working.

It cannot be doubted from the external evidence that a second hand was concerned in the production of this remarkable work, that of John of Jandun. But it appears to Mr. Previt -Orton that the influence of John of Jandun is more pervasive than local, though it may come more to the surface in those few passages where Aristotelian transcription is more complete, and the thought more abstract. The main author, who had 'a paternal affection for his presbyterian system, his erastianism, and a passionate republicanism,' seems to him to be

Marsilius of Padua, 'bred in an Italian commune, hating the ecclesiastical powers which put it out of gear, and anxious to combine the sharply bounded and compact unitary State he loved with a kind of society of Christendom guided by its elected advisory General Council.'

In the Introduction Mr. Previt -Orton gives a useful account of the MSS of the *Defensor*, dividing them, with Professor Scholz, into two classes, which he names the 'French' and 'German' groups respectively, the 'French' text representing in his opinion an earlier recension. He regards the *Editio Princeps* as following with great accuracy a good MS. of the 'German' class. His own text is based on the consensus of T and Q, T being the Tortosa MS. and the best exponent of the 'German' class, and Q the MS. in Magdalen College, Oxford, and an almost perfect representative of the 'French' text. Variants are recorded in the Notes, and the whole handsome volume reflects immense and laborious scholarship.

FROM ABRAHAM TO CHRIST.

In the volume *From Abraham to Christ* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net), which represents the Warburton Lectures for 1923-1927, Canon Vernon F. Storr describes the development of theism in the Old Testament, and forcibly argues that this Old Testament theism is not only of vital importance for us to-day, but is even, strictly considered, the basis of our modern theism. He deals faithfully with the primitive elements in Old Testament religion, but he reminds us that a lowly origin does not discredit a noble ending, and he shows us that even the earlier religion, for all its defects, was prophetic of the later mature monotheism. The purpose of God in the evolutionary process is the production and development of personality, and the Old Testament is alive with the sense of the personality of God and the importance of personality in men. Emphasis on the moral quality of the Divine nature appears from the beginning: it is already present in Moses, and powerful in Nathan and Elijah, and the growing appreciation of the character and purpose of God is traced through Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Deutero-Isaiah, and Jonah. It is in the history of Israel and the religious experience of her great men, and especially her prophets; that the purpose of God is made especially manifest to the world: here, indeed, is 'revelation,' the special creative action of God at particular moments in history and on selected personalities. The long story of the

growth of Old Testament theism is suggestively told. Canon Storr twice quotes, as if original, the beautiful words (pp. 232, 273), which, as the LXX shows, are certainly a mistranslation, 'In all their affliction he was afflicted'; but the words winsomely describe an aspect of Old Testament theism which is of peculiar and almost unique value and which the Canon was more than justified in emphasizing.

A book on *A Liturgical Study of the Psalter* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net) which has the double honour of being introduced by Canon Box and of winning for its author, the Rev. Cuthbert C. Keet, B.A., B.D., the London Ph.D., is worthy of the attention of all students of the Psalter, especially as that aspect of the Psalter with which it deals is very obscure and, as the author is well aware, many of the results are necessarily conjectural. The writer has been profoundly influenced by the investigations of Mowinkel, especially by his treatment of the Psalms dealing with the Accession-Festival; and to those who cannot read German his book has its value as an introduction to the very important work of that able scholar. It raises and tentatively answers such questions as, To what extent did the laity participate in liturgical worship at the time of the Chronicler? and, Were women allowed to sing in the Temple-choirs of post-exilic times?—the former question being answered in the affirmative and the latter in the negative. Dr. Keet believes that Greek music must have left its impress upon the Temple-psalmody, and that in turn Jewish music must have had considerable influence on the Christian Church, though the Hebrews, he maintains, had but small conception of harmony in their instrumentation, and none at all in their vocal music. Psalmody, it is argued, was probably an element in the worship of the primitive synagogue, and indeed some of the psalms, for example, the didactic psalms, were written, not for the Temple but for the synagogue. There is also a brief but suggestive discussion of the text of the Psalter, which, as the facts show, was for long anything but fixed; then apart from inadvertent changes due to careless copyists, there were deliberate changes due to the deepening of spiritual apprehension, which could not be satisfied with older psalms in their original form. These are but a few points touched upon in Dr. Keet's investigation of a relatively unknown field.

At the cheap price of 2s. the Epworth Press have published twenty-two children's addresses by the Rev. C. N. Button, Ph.D. The title is *Out of Focus*. Dr. Button was for three years minister of Candlish United Free Church in Edinburgh. He came to Candlish Church from Australia, and many of the young people remember how interesting he made Australian life and ideas to them. The talks that he has chosen for this volume do not deal with Australia, however, so perhaps he may be planning to follow it with a second one. The last four addresses form a complete children's service—Dr. Button's idea, in which he has succeeded admirably, being to teach the meaning of the different parts of the service. With part four we come to the offering, and here Dr. Button tells a story.

'There was once a little girl who had a favourite dog named Cæsar. She loved Cæsar so much that she thought nothing was too good for him. She always used to save up some of the best pieces of meat at dinner to give to Cæsar. One day, when her mother had some friends to dinner, she was picking out some nice pieces for Cæsar, when her mother said, "Never mind Cæsar now, I'll find something for him afterwards." Then after dinner her mother collected a few scraps, one or two bones, and a little gravy, scraped them all into a dish, and gave it to the little girl for Cæsar. The little girl was very sad at this. She thought it wasn't nearly good enough. By and by she took the dish into the kitchen, where Cæsar was waiting for her, and as she put the dish down on the floor she said sadly, "Here you are, Cæsar, I was going to give you an offering, but mother has sent you a collection."

'Well, in this church we always have offerings and not collections. We may not be able to give very much, but we can give our best, and we can give it cheerfully, with our heart's love in it. Then it becomes an offering, even if it is *called* a collection.'

To the beautiful *Ginsburg Edition of the Hebrew Old Testament* published two years ago, the British and Foreign Bible Society has issued a brief *Introduction*, which is both interesting and valuable (2s. 6d. net). It gives a succinct account of the history and plan, method and scope of that edition, describes the work of the assistants and the arrangements after Dr. Ginsburg's death, explains the meaning and aim of the Massorah, etc. To the average reader the most valuable part of the book will be the chapter on Abbreviations, which will enable him to read with ease the footnotes to the Hebrew text. No amount of intuition would

suggest, for example, that *N*'s stands for 'another copy' or 'other copies': all the words thus contracted are written out in full and explained. For this, even if for no other reason, this little volume deserves a hearty welcome.

An interesting and curious book is *Ideas and Revelation*, by the Rev. F. W. Kingston, B.D. (Heffer; 4s. 6d. net). It is almost unique in one respect. Dr. Oman of Westminster College, introduces the book, which he had to read for some academic purpose, and his introduction is after the manner of Balaam. He praises the writer but has some frank criticism to make of his production. It says a great deal for Mr. Kingston's courage and sincerity that he has printed so frank an introduction and set it beside his own argument. Perhaps the best account one could give of that argument is to say that we get the impression of a man thinking his way through the problem of life and being to his own conclusions. We have found it an interesting task to follow him. He has his own view of the universe, and his own way of explaining it. The main conception in his mind is the difference between ideas and notions. Ideas are revelations, information imposed on us from outside. Natural science, so far as it is knowledge, consists of ideas. Notions are the product of our own minds and generally lead to error. This idea is applied to Revelation, to its consummation in the Incarnation and to its instruments in the sacraments. The book is well worth reading and contains a real contribution in its own way.

The Roman Catholic Church has been very active in propaganda for some time, as well as in the task of instructing its own people. The Summer Schools, which are held annually, probably come under the second of these two activities. We have had a number of volumes containing the lectures given at these schools in past years. The latest deals with *The Church*, and contains the papers delivered at Cambridge in August 1927. It is edited by the Rev. C. Lattey, S.J. (Heffer; 7s. 6d. net). It would be very difficult to deal adequately with these lectures unless we were allowed as much space as they themselves occupy! It will be enough to indicate the main subjects dealt with. These include 'The Old Testament,' 'The New Testament,' 'The Notes of the Church,' 'The Endowments of the Church; Indefectibility and Infallibility,' 'Jurisdiction,' and others. It will be apparent that the book raises some of the questions that chiefly divide Romanism from other

forms of Christian belief, and the arguments run on familiar Romanist lines. Some things stated here, however, will be novel to many readers. One is that not only is the Pope infallible but the bishops also, met in conference and acting in harmony with the Pope! Another is that the Church's infallibility extends not merely to the interpretation of Holy Writ but even to truths of natural science, such as the existence of substance, and to philosophical truths, such as the simplicity of the soul, and to historical truths as, for example, the fact that St. Peter was bishop of Rome! That includes a fair field, and the claim will be a staggering one to most people, if not to many Romanists themselves. This book is valuable to Protestants in showing what the Roman Church actually claims and on what grounds.

The Gospel of St. Paul, by the Rev. Sydney Cave, M.A., D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net), is described by the author as 'an attempt to present the gospel of St. Paul as that of a missionary of the first century who expressed his message in terms of the world-view of his age.' Recent research has thrown a flood of light upon the social environment in which the gospel was first preached, while in regard to St. Paul himself he is seen to be pre-eminently a missionary preacher rather than a systematic theologian. Dr. Cave found, when a missionary in India, 'how closely the paganism to which he had to relate his Christian teaching resembled that of St. Paul's age, whilst the problems which emerged in dealing with immature converts differed little from those with which St. Paul had to deal.' In the present book, while giving a careful and scholarly exposition of St. Paul's doctrine, he has made the happiest use of his own missionary experiences to illustrate the teaching of the Apostle. Take this, for example. 'In turning aside from speculation, and in preaching Christ and Christ crucified, St. Paul was doing what many a missionary to-day finds best to do. Thus, in India it is easy to secure a hearing from high-caste Hindus so long as a man speaks in terms of the philosophy of religion. But a missionary soon learns that interest in the discussion of religion is no proof of moral earnestness. It may even be a substitute for it. The most effective message is simply that of Christ and the significance of His life and death to men. Religious discussion often conceals men's need for forgiveness and renewal. The preaching of Christ may reveal that need, and answer it.'

The author of *The Baptists of London*, Mr. W. T.

Whitley, M.A., LL.D., F.R.Hist.S., must have spent infinite labour in research and compilation. He tells us that 'about 856 Baptist churches founded in the London area since 1612 are catalogued here with an epitome of the history of each' (Kingsgate Press; 10s. 6d. net). Statistics show that about four hundred and forty have ceased to survive as separate churches though they may have amalgamated. The most notable progress of the different Baptist societies was during the reign of Queen Victoria. The church census taken in London in 1903 by the 'Daily News' showed an attendance of 108,000 worshippers in Baptist churches, a total excelled only by that of the Anglican churches. As long ago as 1890 the late John Clifford, the most influential Baptist minister of his day in north London, as Charles Spurgeon was in south London, wrote as follows: 'New ideas are dominant in the life of to-day. The controversies of our fathers are obsolete, and their divisive effects should cease, so that together we may secure that true and healthy reconstruction of religious thought and life for which humanity longs.'

In *Paul the Apostle: His Personality and Achievement* (Longmans; 1s. 6d. net) Professor Peake gives us a glowing and eloquent account of the great Apostle, and compels us to feel afresh his amazing versatility. Great not only as a theologian but as a man, he stands before us in these pages as a pioneer of the first rank, a man strong but conciliatory, passionately conscious of his mission to the Gentiles, yet passionately devoted to his own people, resolute yet conciliatory where principle was not at stake, a very skilful organizer and administrator with the keenest of eyes for strategic situations, a man of rich emotional nature with a genuine strain of poetry in him; above all, a man who 'struck with amazing force into universal history.' He rendered to religion the incomparable service of detaching Christianity from Judaism, while it is 'to him we owe the first Christian theology, apologetic, and philosophy of history.' And he was all this because of his mystical union with Christ, who had made all things new to him. Dr. Peake discusses Paul's quality as a preacher, and three times over he describes his letters as 'great literature,' giving good reasons for this lofty estimate. The charm of the discussion is that, though it obviously rests on an intimate acquaintance with the enormous literature on Paul, it eschews critical technicalities, and we hear throughout it the voice of the earnest preacher rather than that of the accomplished scholar.

The student who is attending his first lectures in Moral Philosophy is faced with no easy task. It is weeks, sometimes months, before he gets his bearings, and from many of the books offered to him he finds little help. To all such students and to all those who are not students but whose minds have been teased by differences in codes of morals and questions as to whether there is something in the nature of acts themselves which make some right and some wrong, and if so, what is this thing—to all such we would commend *The Theory of Morals*, by Mr. E. F. Carritt (Milford; 4s. 6d. net). It is exactly what it sets out to be—an introduction to ethical philosophy. It is written by some one who combines several things which are not too often found together in the writers of text-books on ethics—mastery of the subject, a power of passing rapidly under review various systems of thought, bringing out clearly their dominant ideas and relating these to other systems, and expressing the whole in simple language and in the clearest way.

Sir Hermann Gollancz, D.Litt., Emeritus Professor of Hebrew in the University of London, University College, has published a translation from the Syriac original of a MS. in the British Museum edited in 1880 by Hoffmann of Kiel. With Hoffmann he styles the text, *Julian the Apostate* (Milford; 12s. 6d. net). The British Museum MS. is the only known MS. of the 'Syriac stories,' traced to the sixth and the tenth or eleventh centuries, that clustered around the name of Julian, and it is said to be translated now for the first time. It deals in the first portion with the youth of Julian, from about the death of Constantine the Great to his accession to the throne, and in the second part with the history of Julian from the time of his expedition to Persia until his death. The translation, which is no doubt trustworthy, is very readable, and we may grant the translator's claim that it 'might well be regarded as an historical or legendary treatise, introducing the characters of Julian, Jovian, Eusebius, and others, and can be perused without reference to its Syriac original. The flow of language and the style of composition in the original are matters for students of the Syriac language; but the lofty sentiments expressed in the speeches contained in the work, their warmth and enthusiasm, carried at times to danger-point, . . . must in effect prove interesting and elevating to the general reader and lover of literature.'

First published in 1925, *The Mystery-Religions and Christianity*, by Professor S. Angus, Ph.D.,

D.Lit., D.D., of St. Andrew's College, Sydney, has now been issued by Mr. John Murray in a cheaper edition. The price of the new edition is 10s. 6d. net.

The Rev. L. J. Baggott, the Rector of Newcastle-under-Lyme, believes in doctrinal sermons, and he had the happy idea of giving a course of them on Sunday evenings in Liverpool, taking as his guide the Apostles' Creed. Men and women, especially young men and women, do want to know what the Christian Faith is, and if it holds good to-day. *The Faith for the Faithful* (Nisbet; 5s. net) is 'sent forth with trust in those eternal verities by which men and women can live triumphant lives and stand erect in this period of gravity and heart-searching.' Mr. Baggott does not claim to have made any fresh contribution to Christian apologetics, but he has certainly written a book which should prove very useful to the men and women whom he has in mind.

A new edition in one volume of the famous work on the life of Christ by Père Didon has been published—*The Life of Jesus Christ*, by the late Rev. Père Didon, of the Order of Saint Dominic, with a memoir of the author (Kegan Paul; 10s. 6d. net). This is the sixth edition, and, in order to bring it within the compass of one volume, the book has been slightly abridged, but without sacrificing anything essential. The work took Père Didon seven strenuous years, during which he made many prolonged journeys to the Holy Land. It is only necessary to say that in its new form it makes a handsome and pleasing book to handle and read.

A popular account of the great Conference on Faith and Order held at Lausanne in 1927 has been written by Canon E. S. Woods and published by the Student Christian Movement under the title *Lausanne 1927: An Interpretation of the World Faith and Order Conference* (4s. net). It is a fascinating story, told with both competence and enthusiasm by one who was inside all that went on. When one thinks of the diversity of churches and views represented at the Conference one is amazed at the results achieved. Imagine a body of men consisting of Anglicans, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Baptists, Quakers, Greek Orthodox, and Methodists set down to come to an agreement on questions not only of belief but of organization! It would seem impossible even to get them to think together. And yet any one who reads Canon Woods' engrossing narrative will find that they not only thought together but came into a wonderful fellowship of

outlook, hope, and even positive conclusion. However, the most that could be done was to prepare the ground for the future. And, in particular, two things became clear, one that the Church of the future will be characterized by 'unity with variety,' the other that the churches must be content to have a period of experiment to begin with. Both these conclusions are wise; the first contains an inspiring ideal. In any case such books as this will do much to bring about that blessed time when we shall be content to fix our minds on the big things that unite us, and ignore, or tolerate, what divides us.

The time for giving gifts will soon be upon us. Messrs. Seeley, Service & Co. are ready with six volumes, one of which should suit most tastes.

There are two missionary books—the life of Dr. Arthur Neve, with the title *A Crusader in Kashmir*, and *The Life of Sam Pollard of China*. The price of both these volumes is 6s. And both lives have been written by some one in the closest touch with the subject of them—that of Dr. Arthur Neve being by his brother, Dr. Ernest F. Neve, and Pollard's life by his son, Walter Pollard. Mr. Pollard keeps himself so much in the background that we are not at all certain when he is with his father and when he is out of China, but he knows the life, and he makes the story more vivid by quotations from Pollard's diary. Sam Pollard's most important work, as those who have read 'The Story of the Miao' or Grist's life of him know, were the last years spent among the Miao, an aboriginal hill tribe which was very down-trodden by their Chinese over-lords. He translated the New Testament into Miao. 'We were also baffled by the word "comforter." For a long time all our efforts to find this word failed. Some of the men knew Chinese, and we tried hard to get them to see the meaning of the Chinese word to "comfort," but we failed entirely. It sounds so simple and easy, but in practice our word-hunting was an excitement which led us on and on, but often left us tired and baffled. At last one day "James" came to me and said he would not be able to study that day, as in the village over the other side of the hills, a woman had lost her little child, which had died in the night, and he was going to the home to "... the heart of the parent. I thought at once that the unknown word used by my friend must be the word we had pursued for so long in vain. ... Questionings and explanations proved that the prize was indeed ours. Eureka! once more. I found out from my

friend that the word "to comfort" means "to get the heart around the corners."

A handsome volume, printed in clear, large type and illustrated with excellent photographs, is *The Land Pirates of India*, and the author is Mr. W. J. Hatch (21s. net). It gives an authoritative account of a tribe of Southern India, the Kuravers.

Messrs. Seeley, Service have already published forty volumes in their 'Library of Romance'—some of these not at all likely subjects, such as 'The Romance of Modern Commerce' and 'The Romance of the Post Office.' But there is no doubt about the romance of the latest subject, *The Romance of Modern Travel*. The author is Mr. Norman J. Davidson, B.A. The volumes in this Library are published at the uniform price of 6s. net.

Another handsome volume is *Modern Conceptions of Electricity*, giving a lucid explanation of many of the latest theories concerning atoms, electrons, and other matters relating to electricity, by Mr. Charles R. Gibson, LL.D., F.R.S.E. (12s. 6d. net).

For those who want a boy's story here is *Dick Valliant in the Dardanelles*, by Lieut.-Commander John Irving, R.N. (5s. net).

A Taoist Pearl is the title given to a book by Mr. A. P. Quentin and published by the S.P.C.K. (4s. 6d. net). It is the life story of Siao the Chinese Christian Saint. At the end of the volume there is a brief popular account of Taoism, and the Art designs are specially attractive, being based upon designs found on Chinese walls, porcelain, silks, and coins.

'One snowy morning, when the wind was whistling through the rickety old building that serves as an out-station, I heard him [Siao] get up and dress. Praise, of course, was the first thing on his lips, and in a conversational manner I heard him say, "Lord, how kind thou art! Look at this fine sheepskin gown I have; how cheap it was and how warm I am! Oh, I praise Thee, I adore Thy great unmerited grace." Can you wonder that every one loved him?'

A Biblical Thoroughfare (Student Christian Movement; 7s. 6d. net) is the title of a work in which Dr. N. S. Talbot, Bishop of Pretoria, aims

at giving the technically unlearned layman the general 'hang' of the Bible, to enable him to see the wood as well as the trees. He owes much, confessedly, to other writers such as H. S. Holland, A. S. Peake, and B. H. Streeter, and his work abounds in quotations from other writers as well as from the Bible itself. An evangelical tone is pervasive throughout. The book might be described as a popular Introduction to the Old and New Testaments, and it serves its purpose well of leading the general reader through the 'labyrinth' which the scholars seem to have made 'of what was to our forebears a plain track.' It is interesting to observe that Bishop Talbot frankly declares the early chapters of Genesis to be myth and legend used for the conveyance of spiritual truth, and the Pentateuch to be only in part, and indirectly, ascribable to Moses: 'To ascribe the whole book to Moses is as impossible as to assert that the builder of the Saxon crypt in a cathedral was also the architect of its perpendicular chancel.' In treating of the New Testament he insists on the point that if we would read it historically, we must pass not from the Gospel stories on to the Epistles, but the other way, namely, from the faith and life represented by the Epistles to the Gospel stories.

On the vexed question of *The Original Language of the Apocalypse* (University of Toronto Press) the Rev. R. B. Y. Scott, M.A., B.D., has written a dissertation for the degree of Ph.D. in the University of Toronto. The writer is not afraid to cross swords with Dr. Charles, and, as the result of a minute investigation of the text, he comes to the conclusion that the book is a Hebrew apocalypse translated into Greek. This conclusion is based partly on the frequency of Hebrew idioms in the book, such as the wide use of *δίδωμι* corresponding to the Hebrew *נתן*, but ultimately on the occurrence of mistranslations which, Dr. Scott argues, are not capable of any other explanation. This conclusion is further supported by occasional transliterations: a writer composing in Greek, for example, it is contended, would in 12¹⁰ have used the word *κατήγορος*, not *κατήγωρ*, which looks suspiciously like a plain transcription of the Rabbinic word *קטניגור*. The whole question is well worthy of re-consideration in the light of this fresh discussion.

The Kingdom of God and the Ethic of Jesus.

By THE REVEREND A. B. D. ALEXANDER, D.D., LANGBANK.

Few phrases occur more frequently in the Synoptic Gospels, and few indeed are found more often on the lips of Jesus, than that of the Kingdom of God.

The expression was not originated by Jesus. John the Baptist had already employed it as the note of his preaching. Indeed, the entire story of the Hebrews is coloured by this conception. In the days of their decline the thought of the restoration of the nation as the true Kingdom of God dominates their hopes and aspirations. But, as earthly institutions and agencies failed, the faith of the people became concentrated upon supernatural power. Might not God be expected to restore the Kingdom by heavenly intervention, thus vindicating His ancient people and establishing Israel once more in power by some direct manifestation of His favour? Hence, before the Advent of Jesus, there had grown up a mass of Apocalyptic literature, the object of which was to encourage the national expectation of a New Jerusalem which was to descend from Heaven in some miraculous way and supersede all earthly dominion. The new age was to be inaugurated by a Divine act. Of themselves the people were powerless to hasten its coming. They could only wait patiently till the set time was accomplished and God Himself put forth His arm.

A new school of Biblical interpretation has arisen whose object is to prove that Jesus was largely, if not wholly, influenced in His preaching of the Kingdom by the current Apocalyptic notions of His time. In common with the popular sentiment of His day our Lord believed, it is said, that the end of the world was at hand, and at the close of the present dispensation there would come suddenly and miraculously a new order—the Kingdom of Heaven—into which would be gathered the elect of God. The most prominent advocate of this view in Germany is Professor Johannes Weiss, who maintains that the teaching of Jesus is wholly eschatological. The kingdom which He predicts is supramundane. He did not inaugurate it; He only foretold its immediate advent. Consequently there is no ethics in Jesus' teaching. There is only what may be called an *Interim-Ethic*—an ethic of renunciation and watchfulness. It does not concern Christ to establish a code of morals for this life. All that He does, therefore, is to suggest

temporary or relative precepts for this transitory existence. He has little or no interest in the present. His vision is fixed upon the hereafter. He bids His followers detach themselves from this evil world and turn their gaze in faith upon that which is about to come.

A similar attitude in regard to New Testament criticism has been taken by the late George Tyrrell, the leader of the Modernist party in this country, in his remarkable book, *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, published in 1909. 'Of the nearness of the final catastrophe,' says this author, 'Jesus was convinced. . . . It might burst forth in a year; it could not delay beyond a generation. His work on earth was to prepare and hasten the Kingdom—to close the last chapter of human history. . . . In the kingdom men were to be as the angels of God; the moral struggle with all its conditions and occasions would be over, it would be rewarded by rest in glory, not by the glory of going on.'¹ There is no hint of a Kingdom of Christ—a reign of morality here upon earth to be brought about by the gradual spread of Christ's teaching and example. Jesus did not come to reveal a new ethics of this life, but the speedy advent of a new world in which ethics would be superseded. The morality of Jesus was but the passing condition, not the abiding substance of blessedness. Much of it is coloured by the immediate expectation of the end and is applicable only to a time of emergency. In such a crisis it would seem hardly worth while to assert a thousand claims which in normal circumstances could not be neglected.

The view of our Lord's teaching thus stated presents a problem which seems to resolve itself into two crucial questions: 1. Did Jesus expect a gradual coming of the Kingdom, or did He look for its immediate approach by some sudden act of God? 2. Did Jesus conceive of the Kingdom as a future state only, or as already existent upon the earth in virtue of His own Advent?

With regard to the *first* question: While it must be acknowledged that there are some sayings of Jesus which *do* suggest a sudden and miraculous coming of the Kingdom, these must be taken in connexion with many other passages, not less weighty and important, suggestive rather, of a gradual process—passages of profound ethical

¹ P. 48 f.

import which, it is hardly too much to say, must be regarded as shaping Christ's whole conception of human life and its purposes.

In respect of the *second* question: While there are undoubtedly not a few utterances which point to the future consummation of the Kingdom and to its supra-mundane character, these are not inconsistent with its immediate inauguration and gradual development; on the contrary, they give emphasis and heightening to that aspect of it.

It would be impossible within the scope of this paper to deal adequately with the immense amount of literature which has already appeared upon this subject, but a few considerations may be advanced which, in our judgment, militate strongly against the Apocalyptic interpretation of Christ's teaching. At the outset it may be remarked that this view, as presented by its most prominent champions, would empty the Person and teaching of Jesus of their originality and universality, reducing the Son of Man to the level of a Jewish rhapsodist whose whole function was to incite His countrymen to look away from the present scene of duty towards some mystic future state of felicity which had no connexion with the actual world in which men lived and no real bearing upon their present character and moral discipline. It seems like a caricature to interpret the religion of the New Testament from this standpoint alone, to the exclusion of those directly ethical and spiritual principles in which its power and distinction so notably appear and upon which its finality and permanence depend. Christ spoke, indeed, the language of His time and race, and it was only natural that He should clothe His thoughts in the forms and figures which were then current. But to make the eschatology of the Gospels the master-key of Christ's teaching and message, and to see in Jesus nothing more than a Hebrew enthusiast announcing a Utopian dream, is to distort the perspective of His gospel and rob it of its breadth and unity. Nothing, indeed, is more unlike the serene and gracious personality of the Master as He moves about the villages of Galilee than this picture of nervous apprehension and morbid excitement in view of an approaching catastrophe which these writers have presented.

As a natural consequence of the eschatological character of Christ's teaching, it is contended that Jesus claimed for the moral precepts He uttered not an absolute, but merely a temporary value. The Kingdom was yet to come, therefore the rules of conduct which He announced could have no application beyond the brief interval that was to

elapse before the end of all things. Of course there is a sense in which it might be said that certain directions and rules suitable to particular circumstances and applicable only to some special cases would be naturally superseded, as having no meaning in a perfect state. But it is surely wholly inept to regard such special requirements and casual utterances as constituting the essence of our Lord's teaching. Yet even these sayings of Jesus—words by the way, passing and casual, as we might call them—all run back to the one ultimate demand of inward purity and spontaneous loyalty to the will of God, and are designed to illustrate the nature of the new order. It might be argued that the duty of forgiveness and the virtue of patience under wrong would cease when the injustices of this present world had disappeared. But behind the immediate need of manifesting forbearance and long-suffering there lay the deeper idea of thereby attaining to the Divine likeness. When the Kingdom comes in all its fullness, God's people will indeed share God's nature, and His spirit of love will possess them wholly. Even now by the exercise of these graces they are being gradually prepared for participation in the higher life of the heavenly Kingdom. These virtues, therefore, are not evanescent qualities which must pass away with this fleeting world. They are eternal elements of God Himself, and they must be inwrought into the character and become permanent features of the life of those who are striving to approximate to the ideal which Christ Himself has declared as true for all time: 'Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect.'

Only by a violent dislocation of facts can one affirm that the moral maxims of Jesus are based upon an interim-ethic adapted merely to a transitory age. More correctly would they be described as universal and permanent—true for every world. In all the Gospels there are numerous explicit statements of our Lord which show that He Himself at least was confident that whatever catastrophe might overtake the outward fabric of the world His truth would remain unshaken. 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.' 'We cannot,' says Harnack, 'derive the ethical ideal of Jesus from the eschatological. There is nothing of an Interim-Ethic, nothing feverish and evanescent in humility, forgiveness, purity of heart, sacrifice or service; yet these, and virtues like these, are pillars of Christian Ethics.' The habitual attitude of Jesus in the presence of the great problems of experience reveals a calmness of assurance and steadfastness of purpose far removed

from the temper of excitement and impatience in view of an abrupt and final change. The eschatological interpretation of the Gospels confuses colour with form, by-product with main intention, and finds the ethics of Jesus impracticable because it sees His moral utterances out of that perspective which gave them beauty and truth.

Not renunciation for its own sake but joy in life is the characteristic thing in Jesus' outlook. He does not encourage a spirit of anxious unrest or gloomy foreboding. He recognizes rather the preciousness and potency of the present life, calling men to a new righteousness and a noble sense of responsibility. So far from hinting that the duties which the various relations of life prescribe are not worthy of attention in view of the imminent distress, He counsels unwavering fidelity to the minutest details of daily service. The brevity of life is never urged by Him as a reason for laxity or indifference. It did not make Jesus Himself less zealous in His calling: it only spurred Him to greater ardour. 'I must work the works of him who sent me while it is day.' So far from allowing the uncertainty of the future to act as an opiate or to furnish an excuse for the apathy of fatalism, He ever bids men awake to the solemn realities of life. The message of Christianity, as taught by the Master and His apostles, is, that whether our existence on earth be short or long, its days ought to be nobly filled; and if the fashion of this world is passing away, then all the more earnestly must its opportunities and experiences be seized and consecrated to the service of God and the furtherance and fulfilment of His Kingdom among men.

The spirit of negative quietism and habitual detachment from the practical interests of life, pronounced by Tolstoy to be the proper attitude of Christian Faith, has no countenance in the teaching of Christ. It is true, indeed, that unworldliness, humility, lowliness of spirit, and all absence of self-seeking and masterful assertiveness, are essential marks of the Christian character and have a distinctive place in the ethics of the New Testament. But to identify such so-called 'passive virtues' with apathetic neutrality or light-hearted tolerance in regard to the world's vices and wrongs is wholly foreign to the spirit and example of our Lord. He was essentially a Reformer and a Revealer of the eternal values. No prophet could be more radical in His denunciations of existing evil or more insistent in His demands for absolute righteousness and purity. To confuse, therefore, Oriental passivity with the positive claim of Jesus

to vital decisions and unfaltering ventures of faith; to single out a teaching of non-resistance as the core of the gospel, or to commend retreat from social obligations in the name of One who gladly shared them,—this is not only an impracticable discipleship but an historical perversion. It is to lift fragmentary utterances out of their immediate setting and elevate them into universal laws.

The question which presses with very real urgency upon the modern mind is, Can a man live in this present world and still be a Christian? Is it possible to participate in its business, to be involved in its social and political machinery and at the same time maintain a sober, righteous, and godly life? It hardly comes within the scope of this paper to discuss the various aspects of this question now. But it does seem relevant to the subject in hand to suggest that if Christian discipleship means that home and family ties, the tasks and burdens of business and daily toil are to be renounced as imperilling the soul's salvation, then the gospel of Christ has no real message for practical life, and nought to offer to earnest living men, save a counsel of retreat from the world's conflict and discipline.

Before concluding this paper it will be desirable to refer as briefly as possible to some particular passages in the Gospels which bear upon the question at issue.

It is clear that the problem of the Kingdom was one which was arousing considerable inquiry and discussion among those who had come into contact with Jesus and had listened to His Parables and Discourses. Jesus had said that the Kingdom of Heaven was at hand. But when and how would it come? On one occasion certain Pharisees asked when the Kingdom of God cometh? Knowing that His questioners had in view the establishment of an earthly monarchy and the restoration of the kingdom of Israel, Christ replied: 'The kingdom of God cometh not with observation.' The answer implies that all such expectations are erroneous, and based upon an imperfect conception of God's purpose. It will not come in the crude material form you expect it. It will be no spectacular or dramatic event. The Kingdom is indeed already here. It is in your midst. It must have been on some such occasion that many of the Parables referring to the Kingdom were spoken—especially those drawn from Nature, such as, the Parables of the Sower, the Tares, the Mustard-Seed, and the Leaven. The object is obviously to show that the sudden catastrophic notion of the coming of the Kingdom must give place to the deeper and

worthier idea of growth. Its progress was to be like the seed hidden in the earth, and growing day and night by its own inherent germinating force.

The conception underlying our Lord's teaching may be further gathered from St. Matthew's version of 'The Lord's Prayer,' where we are bidden to pray: 'Thy kingdom come, thy will be done.' The second clause indicates the way in which the Kingdom is to come. The Kingdom is God's rule which means the fulfilment of God's Will. Jesus came to establish God's sway upon the earth. In order to do so, the distinctive note of our Lord's ministry was to urge His hearers to live in accordance with the Divine Will; and the prayer which He taught His disciples requires of them and all future followers that they should consecrate their gifts along every line of effort for the fulfilment of God's Will. With the beginning of His preaching the Kingdom of God began—the assertion of the Divine sovereignty in and over the hearts and lives of men as distinguished from the kingdom of evil. It is no vague aspiration for some far-off perfect state. It is a prayer for the immediate hour, for the living practical present. Into this Kingdom those only may come who acknowledge God's sway, and are ready to do His Will. All such may be said to have 'Life,' in a distinctive sense. But the 'life' here and now is only the beginning of a life which is to last through all eternity. Here, indeed, the Kingdom is imperfect and incomplete. But it will be a growing Kingdom, and there will come a time when God's dominion will be universal and absolute and all who do God's Will shall inherit eternal life.¹

The Kingdom may be thus regarded as equivalent to practical Christianity. When our Lord began His ministry, by affirming 'the kingdom of heaven is at hand; repent, and believe the gospel,' His language may have been differently interpreted by different people. Some may have thought He meant that at last the yoke of Rome was to be cast off and the kingdom of their father David was to be established. Others may have construed His words as meaning: 'The day of the Lord is at hand.' The Son of Man is about to come in judgment, and a new heaven and a new earth will be immediately revealed. But obviously Jesus did not mean either of these things. He meant, I am come to teach you to fulfil God's Will, to implant in your hearts the Word of God. I am come to destroy the kingdom of evil upon the earth—

¹ See here how the teaching of the Synoptics comes into line with the Fourth Gospel.

not indeed by material force, or earthly might, but solely by the Spirit of God, working in and through men's hearts and lives. The Kingdom of which I speak will come not suddenly but slowly. Its growth will be gradual and inconspicuous. It will permeate the world as the leaven, and silently and unobtrusively pervade and transform the entire realm of human life.

It will be impossible here to examine in detail all the passages for which a purely Apocalyptic meaning has been claimed. Many of these lend themselves quite naturally to a figurative interpretation and are in harmony with our Lord's usage of parabolic and metaphorical language. There is, however, one example we may cite, since it has been stressed as a definite prophecy of the immediate catastrophic advent of the Kingdom. In Mk 9¹, Jesus says: 'Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power.' In Mt 16²⁸, a more definite eschatological note has been struck by substituting the words: 'Till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.' This change of language suggests a tendency to modify the words in an eschatological sense. *There*, it is said, we have a clear and unmistakable announcement of the nearness of the 'Parousia.' But impartially regarded there is surely nothing in the mere form of words to enforce such a meaning. The coming of the Kingdom with power might quite as well refer to the Descent of the Holy Ghost, to the Pentecostal outpouring of the Spirit, to the inner spiritual power within the early Church, or it might even be taken to describe the progressive advance of Christianity throughout the world which had already begun to manifest its triumphant power over men's lives. Any of these interpretations may be regarded as in no way inconsistent with the general teaching of our Lord, and indeed more in harmony with what we know has actually taken place.

But the most decisive argument for the interpretation of Christ's teaching regarding the Kingdom of God which has been here maintained, is that it is in full accord with the rest of His Work and Words. It is in harmony with the new law of righteousness enunciated in the Sermon on the Mount and in agreement with Christ's ethical teaching throughout the Gospels. It implies a complete transformation of the Hebrew idea of righteousness; so radical and yet so positive that while in one sense it supersedes, in another it also fulfils the ancient law. It means nothing less

than a complete reconstruction of all human ideals, and ultimately an entire enrichment of all ethical and social conditions of earthly life. To what purpose, it has been asked,¹ would have been the ethical teaching of Jesus, if the end of all things was to come at once? It would have been, as one has said, a futile waste of labour. What would have been the use of propounding an absolute and universal ethic, adapted to the character and conditions of the whole world, and intended, for all men of all time and every race, if the moral principles and truths He proclaimed had admittedly only a temporary application, and were not fraught with ultimate and eternal values? We have misread the New Testament if we do not rise from its perusal with the conviction that the Redeemer came as a living man into a weary and distraught world, and by inculcating a living message of the Fatherhood of God and His Divine purpose for all mankind, gave a new inspiration and a spiritual elevation to the dreams and aspirations not only of those who were devoutly waiting

¹ See *The Life and Teaching of Jesus, the Christ*, by A. C. Headlam, D.D., Bishop of Gloucester, 1923, p. 264.

for the consolation of Israel, but to His own and every succeeding age. To interpret the Kingdom of God from a narrow Apocalyptic point of view, and to depict our Lord as the propounder of a merely temporary ethic, is surely to miss the spiritual insight, the originality and breadth of our Saviour's life and teaching.

If we sum up the meaning of the Kingdom of God as presented in the Gospels, three conceptions, not entirely separate from one another, but blending together, may be regarded as its essential elements. The first is the Kingdom, as a principle of life and conduct in men's hearts. As such it is not something which is to come in outward show, but something which is already here. The second is what is sometimes called the Christian Church, but is better described as Christianity, looked upon as a mighty progressive force in the world. The third is the Kingdom as the final consummation of all things. The Kingdom may thus be regarded in three aspects: as Present, Progressive, and Future—as a *Gift* immediately bestowed by Jesus; as a *Task* to be worked out in the history of the world; as a *Hope* to be consummated in the heavenly life.

The Historical Method and the Preacher.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN E. MCFADYEN, D.D., GLASGOW.

II.

HOMILETICS AND HISTORY.

Theophanies.

ANOTHER aspect of this problem for the preacher is created by the presence of theophanies and miracles in the narratives with which he deals, and by the existence of parallels revealed by the study of comparative folk-lore. As an illustration of this last source of perplexity may be mentioned the account of the birth of Sargon, king of Accad. 'My mother'—the inscription runs—'who was poor, conceived me and secretly gave birth to me; she placed me in a basket of reeds, she shut up the mouth of it with pitch, she abandoned me to the river, which did not overwhelm me. The river bore me away, and brought me to Akki, the drawer of water, who received me in the goodness of his

heart,' etc. No one can read this tale without wondering whether it has in any way affected the story of the birth of Moses. Again, in the earlier historical books of the Old Testament God or His angel frequently appears bodily upon the scene, speaking to men face to face as a man to his friends. Abraham in Gn 18 is visited by three supernatural wayfarers, one of whom is Jehovah Himself, and he entertains them hospitably. Their feet are washed, and they partake of 'the butter and milk, and the calf which Abraham had dressed.' Did these things happen as they are recorded or did they not? If they did, we shall have to revise pretty drastically our conception of God and to deny what reason and Scripture unite in affirming, that 'no man hath seen God at any time.' If they did not, then in what sense, if in any, is the preacher still free to use the narratives which record them?

Miracles.

These tales may be taken as the primitive expression of the fellowship that may subsist between God and mortal men. But far more perplexing to the preacher is the use he may make of narratives involving the miraculous within periods that are definitely historical. A crucial instance would be the great cycles recording the deeds of Elijah and Elisha. Both, especially the Elisha cycle, abound in incidents which will seem to many educated men to be legendary rather than historical in the strict sense of the word. Did contact with Elisha's body really bring back a child from the dead? Still more may we ask, Did a dead man revive and stand upon his feet from simple contact with the dead prophet's bones? Did the Phœnician woman's jar of meal waste not and her cruse of oil not fail? Did fire descend from heaven and consume the sacrifice upon Elijah's altar? There are critical scholars, like Kittel, who accept the last incident at any rate as sober fact. If, however, a preacher has come to believe that an atmosphere of legend lies about these cycles, charged as they are with so much literary beauty and religious insight, must he then, however sorrowfully, abandon the right to use them? It would appear that he must, if he accepts the dictum, that preaching from a historical narrative is illegitimate, if its history be not real history. His natural hesitation to treat miracle as history will be increased if he observes, as he may both in Old and New Testament, the tendency to enhance the miraculous. This tendency is demonstrable in the story of the retreating shadow on the sun-dial—compare Is 38^{7f.} with 2 K 20^{9f.}—and in the story of the daughter of Jairus, who in Mk 5²³ is at the point of death when her father summons Jesus (cf. Lk 8⁴²), while in Mt 9¹⁸ she is already dead.

The Patriarchal Stories.

What, again, is the preacher to do with the patriarchal stories, if his studies have led him to believe that these describe the movements and experiences of tribes rather than the careers of individual men?—if, for example, Shechem's violation of Jacob's daughter and the retaliation upon Shechem by Jacob's sons in Gn 34 are to be interpreted in the light of the amalgamation and the struggle of Israelites and Shechemites as recorded in Jg 9? Or again, if the days of Abraham, assuming him to have existed, seem too distant for tradition to have preserved any genuine reminiscence

of his career, the moving story of the all but consummated sacrifice of Isaac (Gn 22) will evaporate into a late prophetic protest against child sacrifice—valuable indeed as a noble indictment of a horrible practice, but not as an incident in Abraham's career, or as an illustration of his sublime faith and submission to what he believed to be the will of God. On the tribal treatment of the patriarchal stories all the personal quality which has endeared these tales to fourscore generations vanishes and leaves the preacher with a sense of irreparable loss. Many will think that Stade treats this matter too lightly when he remarks¹ that for the use of these tales in religious instruction it is a matter of indifference whether the record is historically true, if only it has an inward truth and can be used for moral and religious education.

But the problem created for the preacher by these stories cannot be ultimately separated from that of the earlier chapters of Genesis, which record the story of the temptation and fall of 'our first parents.' He would indeed be a bold man who to-day would regard it as a literal history of the first human pair. Here surely, if anywhere, we are within the prehistoric period, of which, in the nature of the case, we have no authentic literary memorial, and of which we may be truly said to know nothing except by inference. Yet every man who knows his own heart knows that the story is true: it is the story of his own fall; and no sensible man will quarrel with the primitive and mythical form in which its searching thoughts are clothed. Adam (אדם) is man, and his story is ours. The writer treats him, and doubtless regards him, as the first individual man, but that does not invalidate the power of the story over our own hearts and consciences. Similarly, it is very probable that the Hebrew historians regarded, as they certainly treated, the patriarchs as individuals. The chequered careers of Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph are portrayed by historians who, one can hardly doubt, accepted them as historical personalities, through whom the Divine purpose for Israel and the world was gradually evolving, and the preacher, in so accepting them, but follows in their footsteps; if he errs, he errs in good company. So we are brought back to recognize the essential justice of Stade's contention that the narratives, whether literal history or not, have an inner truth which peculiarly qualifies them to be vehicles of edification.

¹ *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, vol. i. p. 66.

The Christian Faith and the Christian Facts.

This argument, however, is not without its peril to a faith like Christianity, which professes to rest upon history, for it could readily issue in a depreciation of the importance of the Christian facts. Schmiedel, for example, thus confesses his independence of them: 'My innermost religious possession would be in no way injured, if I were obliged to-day to reach the conviction that Jesus never lived. I would, of course, miss being able to look back and up to Him as a real person; but I would know that the measure of piety which has long been mine could not be lost again simply through my inability to derive it any longer from Him?' In the same strain G. Lowes Dickinson maintains that the inspiration of the recorded life and sayings of Jesus 'would be the same, whether he regarded the record of the Gospels as myth or fact, and would depend, not on the existence of Christ in the past or in the present, but on the conception of life embodied in His story.' Whether this attitude will commend itself to us or not is largely a question of intellectual temperament. Probably, however, for most people the power of the gospel story would be incalculably diminished, if its central Figure were suspected to be a creature of the imagination, or even if—short of this—its leading incidents were felt to be fiction rather than fact. They would agree with Mardon in disputing Mark Rutherford's contention that 'what the four evangelists recorded was eternally true, and the Christ-idea was true whether it was ever incarnated or not in a being bearing His name. "Pardon me," said Mardon, "but it does very much matter. It is all the matter whether we are dealing with a dream or with reality. I can dream about a man's dying on the cross in homage to what he believed, but I would not perhaps die there myself; and when I suffer from hesitation whether I ought to sacrifice myself for the truth, it is of immense assistance to me to know that a greater sacrifice has been made before me—that a greater sacrifice is possible."' Believers in the significance of history for faith may reassure themselves by remembering that whereas, in the patriarchal stories, centuries separate the record from the fact, the story of Jesus was written between one and two generations after His death, and much of it must have the value of practically contemporary evidence.

The Historian and the Preacher.

Within the Old Testament, however, we ought carefully to distinguish between the task that the

record presents to the modern historian and the preacher respectively. The writer of the history of the Hebrew people, if he is persuaded that the patriarchal stories preserve in the main reminiscences of tribal or national experiences, or that legend has mingled with the story of Moses and the wilderness wanderings, is obviously not free to treat the patriarchs as the fathers of the Hebrew people or the Book of Exodus as if it had the value of a contemporary record. He may not feel that he has the solid ground of properly authenticated history beneath his feet till he reaches the days of Deborah, and his sketch of the period before her may have to be drawn in the vague, broad lines suggested by tradition and supplemented by inferences derived from the subsequent history. But the preacher is under no such constraint. He places himself at the point of view of the writers who gave the narrative its present form and whose motive in writing was unquestionably not so much to instruct as to edify their contemporaries. One might roundly say, indeed, that the whole Bible is inspired by this aim. In the preface to the Book of Judges (2¹¹⁻³⁶) even the unpractised ear can detect the earnest voice of the preacher, warning his contemporaries against the perilous folly of idolatry and urging upon them his passionate plea for the wholehearted service of Jahweh. This religious aim runs through the Bible like a thread of gold (cf. Jn 20³¹) and the historical books come home to us with a vividness immeasurably enhanced, when we learn to summon before our imagination the readers to whom they were first addressed. When we remember, for example, that Gn 22¹² was written not long before Mic 6⁷, we begin to see that the real importance of the story in Genesis lies not in any biographical information it furnishes about Abraham, but in its emphatic repudiation of child sacrifice as a custom abhorrent to the God of Israel. The historian and the prophet are engaged in the same task: each is in his own way striking at a cruel custom which was not only practised by his contemporaries, but which persisted for over a century later (Jer 7³¹).

In reading a historical passage three considerations have always to be kept in mind: (i) the facts. What are the facts? This is a question for the historian. (ii) The spirit in which the facts are treated—the spirit that makes for edification. It is with this that the preacher is concerned. (iii) The Jewish readers and the impression the narrative would make upon them. Let us illustrate this by the narrative in Jos 1. (i) In the Divine summons to Joshua the modern historian would discount the

injunction to remember the Law, because he does not believe that this book was in existence till centuries after Joshua's time. (ii) But this is obviously a point precious to the narrator; *he* wishes to urge upon his readers the careful observance of the Law. And (iii) the readers, whose presence is palpably felt in this allusion, are plainly in view throughout the chapter; when they reach the words in v.¹⁵ that promise rest and the possession of the land, they feel that in *their* present possession of the land the promise has been fulfilled. The whole passage thus becomes alive with the experience of every successive generation of readers. But all this is to say that the voice is the voice of the preacher rather than of the historian; his aim is, like that of the prophets, to bring his people back to God and good. The Biblical historians are indeed nearer in spirit to the modern preacher than to the modern historian, and the preacher who concentrates on the religious teaching of a passage whose historicity is unauthenticated or even dubious is acting on the principle enunciated by Thomas à Kempis, that 'each part of the Scripture is to be read with the same spirit wherewith it was written'—a counsel equally valuable, whether we spell 'spirit' with a small or a capital S.

The Preacher's Use of Prophecy.

In prophecy the case is not dissimilar. Frequently, as we have seen, it is impossible to determine the background with any certainty: in that case, what can the preacher do but confine himself to the religious truth of the passage, when that is clear beyond cavil? In this connexion Sir George Adam Smith's recent revision of his exposition of Isaiah, published forty years ago, is highly instructive. No expositor was ever at greater pains to ascertain the historical background, but occasionally he has to confess himself baffled. That does not prevent him, however, from exploring and exploiting the religious implications even of those sections whose background is doubtful. The progress of critical opinion during the period between the original edition and the revision has thrown doubt upon the date and authorship assumed for certain sections of the prophecy in the original edition, but in most cases this has not led to any modification in the homiletic treatment of them. The earlier treatment of 10⁵⁻³⁴, for example, rested on the assumption of its unity and authenticity. 'But,' Dr. Smith goes on to say, 'whether the passage be composed of oracles delivered by Isaiah at different times, or parts of it be not from Isaiah,

are questions which do not affect its religious teaching as expounded and applied above.'¹ Similarly, of the oracle on Tyre in ch. 23, on whose unity, date, and authorship, critical opinion is divergent, he writes: 'Whatever its date or dates may be, it represents the attitude of Hebrew prophecy to ancient commerce and the Phœnician chiefs of this. I therefore allow the following paragraphs to stand pretty much as I first wrote them.'² On any view of the date it remains the classic 'criticism of the temper of commerce from the standpoint of the religion of the God of righteousness.' In the prefatory comment on ch. 24 in both editions occur the words, 'Criticism affords little help. It cannot clearly identify the chapter with any historical situation.'³ Nevertheless the exposition and application are as vivid and effective as any in the book. 'Perhaps,' he adds—and these are very significant words—'the moral truths are all the more impressive that the reader is not distracted by temporary or local references.' The relative unimportance, in certain circumstances, of an ascertainable historical background, could not be more plainly asserted than here.

The widest difference of opinion prevails with regard to the oracle in Is 2²⁻⁵, which has its parallel in Mic 4¹⁻⁴. Micah may have borrowed it from Isaiah, or Isaiah from Micah, or both from an older prophecy, or the passage may in both books be a later insertion: it has been variously assigned to the eighth century, the seventh, the sixth, and even to the Greek period. But its vision of a world whose hatred of war has led it to settle international disputes by arbitration makes its perennial appeal, to the persuasiveness of which no knowledge of its historical background could really add one jot or tittle. Indeed, the great passages of the Bible, such as Ps 23, Lk 15, 1 Co 13, speak home to the universal heart, just because they are so little encumbered by the things that are local and temporary. The three quotations of our Lord from Deuteronomy in the hour of His temptation belong to a world which is not affected by questions of chronology. The view that the Song of Songs is a miniature drama has been recently replaced by the view that it is a Hebrew adaptation of a Tammuz-Ishtar liturgy, and other views are possible; but whatever its ultimate origin, its lovely music wakes an echo in every heart that has known anything of that love which many waters cannot quench nor floods drown. Thus alike in the historical, the prophetic, and the poetical books the

¹ Vol. i. p. 171.

² Revision, vol. i. pp. 437 f.

³ Vol. i. p. 296.

preacher's quest is for the eternal things. He will rejoice in every historical background he can discover, for in it he will feel again the throb of that ancient life through which the Divine message was originally mediated, but it is with the message rather than the facts that he is concerned. One of the reasons for the unwithering vitality of the psalms is that their writers confine themselves to essential things. They drop most of whatever is adventitious; they express the universal quality inherent in their particular situation, and other men of later times and distant places can thus make those ancient words their own. 'Enquire not,' says Thomas à Kempis, 'who spoke this or that, but mark what is spoken.' To men in such a mood exact historical origins matter very little.

THE HISTORICAL METHOD INDISPENSABLE.

The peril of this attitude is, however, both obvious and real. The preacher, if he be temperamentally indolent, will be only too likely to welcome an argument which seems to relieve him of much irksome and apparently unprofitable toil: he will be tempted to snap at the obvious, to prefer intuition to an investigation which often seems to lead nowhere; he will gladly eschew a process which tends, he feels, to confuse rather than clarify his understanding of a passage and to cripple his power of dealing with it effectively.

But to this and to every contention which would depreciate the value of the historical method there is a twofold answer. First, the method has already rendered incalculable service in the interpretation of the Bible by recovering the historical realities among which the ancestors of our faith lived and moved and had their being, and by bringing the personalities of the Bible out of the shadow-land in which dullness and indolence have hidden them, into the world of light, where we can look upon their earnest faces and share their fears and hopes, their doubt and struggle and faith. It is very possible to exaggerate the limitations of the method. Much remains obscure and uncertain, but much, very much, is now plain. If the problems on which meantime certainty is unattainable are neither few

nor unimportant, the area which we may now tread with confidence is very spacious. From the sections of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah, whose authenticity is undisputed, we can derive a clear and vivid picture of the social and religious life of the latter half of the eighth century B.C., and we mark with astonishment how like, in things essential, that age is to our own. Sir George Adam Smith, who has so frankly confessed the limitations of the historical method in its application to some of our existing data, has, by the use of the same method, laid bare a wealth of homiletic treasure hitherto undreamt of by the average preacher and kindled him to prophetic utterance. If the Bible, on the side of its humanism, is vastly more alive and appealing to our own age than it has ever been before, it is the historical method we have to thank.

But again, no honest effort to determine the historical background is ever altogether fruitless. If it does not always achieve results, it achieves an atmosphere, and for the business of the preacher this is nearly as important as the other. The effort involves a fine exercise of the historical imagination, and, though we may be quite unable to define the situation with precision, there rises subtly within our minds the assurance that we are in genuine contact with phenomenal as well as spiritual reality, and we proceed to direct the energy of our imagination upon the commanding and essential features of the situation, which are often clear enough, even when the period within which it falls is obscure. Every sincere attempt to piece the scattered hints together will carry us deeper into the living history behind them and into the writer's heart.

Never again can men who have breathed the atmosphere of free inquiry build their interpretations of Scripture upon the shifting sands of allegory or typology. Doubtless spiritual things are spiritually discerned, but these things have been mediated through historical experience; and, so long as the preacher confesses his debt to the past by using as his text-book an ancient literature, so long does he lie under the obligation to acquaint himself, in every way open to him, with the life reflected in that literature. That is the historical method. By it we must interpret, for it is the only method we have.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Make Haste.

BY THE REVEREND J. H. MORRISON, M.A.,
ABERDEEN.

'Salute no man by the way.'—Lk 10⁴.

WHAT a strange thing for Jesus to say, and how rude! We all salute our friends, don't we? Some of you are in the Boys' Brigade or the Scouts and can salute in style, but we all do it in our own way. We would never think of passing our friends on the road without a smile and a nod or a cheery wave of the hand. And, if we did, they would take it that we were offended and did not want to be friends any more. What can Jesus have meant?

Well, to understand His meaning you must remember that every country has its own customs. Take China, for instance. The old-fashioned Chinese are the most polite people in the world. One of their rules of politeness is that if you meet a friend on the road and you are riding while he is on foot, you must on no account return his salute without first coming down off your horse or out of your carriage and standing on the ground beside him. Now this rule is very awkward if you are in a hurry, or if a farmer comes into the town in his cart on a market-day and is meeting friends every few yards. So the Chinese get round the difficulty by this other rule, that if you see your friend coming along riding, you turn your head away and don't salute him as you pass and so hinder him.

Now all people are not so wise and considerate as the Chinese. In Palestine, as throughout the East, people were in no hurry and went about everything in the most leisurely way. If you met a man on the road, ten to one he would stop and ask you, 'What is your name? and where have you come from? and where are you going? and what are you going to do there?' In fact, he would keep you all day with his questions if you did not determinedly break away from him and get on. Do you remember the old story of Elisha and the boy who had died? The prophet said to his servant Gehazi, 'Take my staff and run: if thou meet any man, salute him not; and if any salute thee, answer him not.' He was to run right on, stopping for nobody, because his errand was so important. This was exactly what Jesus had in mind when He sent out His disciples and said to them, 'Salute no man by the way.'

Now this teaches us two things. First, that when we have anything important to do we must go right on with it, and not turn aside for anybody. I am sure your mother has often said to you just what Jesus said to His disciples. When she sent you on an errand she said, 'Now run, and don't speak to anybody on the road.' Because she knows that if you meet your chums and begin to talk, you'll soon join in the game and your message will be quite forgotten. It is the same with your lessons. You know how your eyes *will* wander off the book to watch a fly crawling up the window or a rain-drop running down, and you have to drag them back to the dreary page. Oh what a tempting world this is, with all sorts of curious things to see and all sorts of bypath meadows to roam in! Wouldn't we be happy if we could just wander aimlessly around? No, for there is something bigger and nobler to be done, and we must brace ourselves to it. We have all been sent into the world on some great errand, and we must get on with it. Let nothing turn us aside.

And the second lesson is, that the most important thing in the world is to tell people about Jesus and carry His gospel to all nations. When Jesus sent His first disciples on that errand He said, 'Make haste, and stay the work for nobody.' The Africans have a story about the lizard and the chameleon. These two little creatures are very like each other, but the lizard is alert and swift, the chameleon creeps by fractions of an inch. Well, the story goes that in the beginning of the world God sent a message of life to men and commissioned the chameleon to carry it. Afterwards He sent a message of death to men by the swift running lizard. The lizard far outran the crawling chameleon, whose message of life, when at last it arrived, was simply laughed at. And so, say the Africans, that is why death is in the world. When I heard them tell that story out in Central Africa, I said, 'No wonder they say such things to our shame, for nineteen hundred years have passed since God's message of life was given in Jesus Christ and it has not reached many of these poor Africans even yet.' We print on our church and missionary papers the emblem of the flying dove to show how we should fly abroad with the gospel message. I wonder sometimes if it would not be better to change that, and put on the emblem of the crawling chameleon.

Who among you will try to wipe away this reproach? Some of you could perhaps go yourselves

as the messengers of Jesus to far-off lands, and some, who cannot go themselves, could help to send others.

A Washed-out Flag.

By THE REVEREND J. HOWARD STOOKE, BRISTOL.

'We know that thou art true.'—Mk 12¹⁴.

People said that of Jesus. Was it just a mere empty compliment, or did they really mean it? They might well have meant it, for He was the Truth.

Some months ago I was in the suburbs of a city and was waiting for a 'bus. As I looked down the long road for it, I noticed a flag flying from a staff in some one's garden. As I happen to be interested in flags, and as this seemed to be a strange one, I went up the road to have a look at it, although this meant missing the 'bus. When I got near, I found that I had wasted my time, for it wasn't a proper flag at all; at one time it had been a Union Jack, but it was one no longer.

Shall I explain?

We all know that our Union Jack is made up of three crosses. There is the red cross of St. George for England, and the white cross (saltire they call it) of St. Andrew for Scotland, and the red saltire of St. Patrick for Ireland. The old English flag was just the cross of St. George, then in 1707 the cross of St. Andrew was added, and in 1800 the cross of St. Patrick made a third—and that is our Union Jack.

Now this flag that attracted my attention had once been a Union Jack, but not of good quality, I fancy it was just a printed flag and its owner had left it out in all winds and weathers so that *the blue had been washed out*. When I saw it, it was just a pale mixture of red and white, no wonder I did not recognize it.

Why am I telling you this? In all the great flags of the world the colours stand for something. The people didn't just say, 'These colours will look pretty, let us have them.' Oh no! In the old days the colours had a meaning—RED always stood for Sacrifice, the colour of blood; WHITE always stood for Purity, the colour of driven snow; BLUE always stood for Truth, Honour, and Loyalty. So what the Union Jack means is that the British Empire is based on Sacrifice, Purity, and Truth.

Now think for a moment—a flag with the blue washed out speaks of a life with no truth in it. That can't be yours, can it?

Mother says, 'Did you do that, Jack?' You

say, 'No, Mother.' But you did do it. A friend says to you, 'Will you promise to do it?' You say that you will, but you do not mean to do it, and you don't do it. Are you a boy whose word cannot be taken, a girl who cannot be trusted? Then you are very much like the flag with the blue washed out, and you will be of little use to any one until that is altered.

They came to Jesus, and said, 'We know that thou art true.' They could say that of Him, for He never said a false word and never broke a promise. He was true, always true. Should you not like to be like Him? Pray every day that God will make you true, as Jesus was true, so that you can be of use to God in the world.

The Christian Year.

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Light of Life.

'He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.'—Jn 8¹².

It is perhaps sometimes conceived by us as a disadvantage that we must think. Life would certainly be simpler if there were no question-mark in our minds. As it is, we perceive that every question has its other side. And, as regards the greater things, we may be inclined to acknowledge, almost bitterly, that it is by faith that a man must walk; for it is certainly not by sight.

At the same time we have lives to live. And we shall not live well if we live in darkness. *Some* light must be cast upon our faith, if we are to see; ahead of us the gleam must beckon, if we are to walk and not faint. Wherefore, let us look at this great word of His, 'He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.'

It is a word which has two points in it. A condition is laid down—'he that followeth me'; and a result is promised in curious phraseology—'shall have the light of life.'

1. The condition is that we are to follow Christ. Now, we cannot in any sense be said to be following Christ, unless we have an anxiety for God, that is at once humble and reverent.

Is it not true that with some of our sense of the perplexity of life a certain amount of self-complacency is mingled?—that there is an awareness of our own mental development implied in our emphasis upon our uncertainties; as if we implicitly said, 'We may leave our sister and our parents and all past generations, their early heaven,

their happy views. We would not, for the world, with shadowing doubt confuse them. But as for us, God made us clever; and, ah me! the mysteries close down upon us.'

Again, that an irreverent mind is not likely to find a solution to perplexities is a statement that needs no support. Life is too grave, and God is too holy and too secret, death is too real, and love makes living too splendid and too sad, for the light-minded to win the seeing that Christ gives.

But especially, we have to display humility and reverence *in anxiety for God*. There is the one attitude, 'It is a matter of small concern; I will leave it.' There is another, 'I will wrestle on towards Him, desiring Him; and if darkness overwhelm me, it is not because I have not striven to find.'

But when Jesus calls us to follow Him, it is not so much, of course, to imitate His attitude towards the unseen—for He never doubted God, with whom it was His supreme consciousness to be at one—as to follow Him in His practical attitude towards living. What He says is, 'Live after my pattern, and ye shall have the light of life.'

We have many a time discussed the problems of living, and with a sigh, perhaps a half-assumed sigh, have envied the full assurance of a Stephen or a Paul. Have we never in the recesses of our own souls felt a discomfort, queer and undefinable, but there for all that? For we stand in a Garden of Perplexity, with a secret to unravel. Round us there are many paths, along which the solving of the secret may be found. There is the path of proof. We may have tried it. But the sum will not work out. We have not the capacity; and if we had the fullest ever given to man, the sum will not work out. There is the path of emotional uplift. At a season, we thought that we had found what we wanted there. But the chill wind came; and we have not our solving yet. So back we are in the Garden of Perplexity, and neglecting a path that remains—the path of self-sacrifice; and knowing that the secret is there. But the way of it is set with sharp stones, and our feet are bare; and the thorns of it will tear our hands, and our hands are tender.

Christianity offers two difficulties. One is to the intellect; the other is to the will. A little more emphasis upon the latter might help us in regard to the former. Let us try living! In common duty, amidst weariness, in common truth, in common charity, in having a mind for our brother and our

sister and their burdens; in all things following the Lord, let us see if His promise holds good.

2. And mark what that promise is. Not that we will have a complete solution of the problems. People have spoken as if a good man could pronounce between Calvin and Zwingli, or solve the problem of the Trinity. That is quite absurd. What is said is, 'Ye shall have light of life.' That stands true. Light for living is what comes. A man who follows Christ comes to believe, through experience, in the love that is about him all the days; in the greatness and value of life in Christ; in the possibility of unspeakable achievement for himself; in the complete forgiveness of sins; in God in him, his strength.

And that is enough to be going on with. God does not clear up everything; but He gives us enough by which to live nobly; and at each advance He will give us more knowledge of Himself, though it may be that only death will show to some that all this goodness and wonder and half-known companionship are just Himself.¹

ARMISTICE DAY.

Fellowship and Group-Loyalty.

'The Father, from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named.'—Eph 3¹⁴. (R.V.).

Any decent philosophy of the state will find the real ground of society in the social character of personality. Society cannot be rightly regarded as an aggregation of individuals contracting with one another to live together. It is rather to be regarded as the expression of an inner necessity of human life. Man is by nature a social being, and to try to think of man apart from society is to think of something which is not man at all. Man has come to be what he is, and will grow up to what he can become, only in and through a social life. This line of thought is now so familiar as to be almost a platitude. But it is clear now that we cannot stop there. Behind this fact there lies a deeper fact. Just in so far as human personality is the expression of the Divine Spirit—*i.e.* as man is made in the image of God—so far the social nature of personality has its roots in the social nature of God. Man must be always striving for fellowship because God's life is perfect fellowship. Ultimately no psychology and no philosophy of human nature can make sense unless it starts with God. We can only really believe in human nature if our thought is based on faith in God.

¹ J. R. P. Sclater, *The Enterprise of Life*, p. 357.

Now here Christianity comes directly into opposition with a certain tendency in the modern world. There is in popular writing nowadays a great deal of very vague thinking about what is loosely called the 'gregarious instinct.' It is taken for granted, that in some mysterious and convenient fashion the spontaneous operation of this instinct widening out into ever larger circles will automatically produce the world-state. 'It has created national patriotism: very soon it will lead to internationalism.' But the facts of history give little warrant for this amiable supposition. The gregarious instinct is no unmixed blessing. Left to itself indeed, and undirected, it rather hinders than advances progress. Its crude operation seems to divide men rather than unite them. Just as, by the strange alchemy of Nature, the anti-social instinct of pugnacity has become one of the strongest forces by which societies are held together; so, as though to balance this anomaly, the unfettered play of the social instinct has served to organize groups of men in intense hostility to one another.

Christian fellowship starts not with the thought of local groups, adding them together into a world-group. It starts with God, whose life is perfect fellowship, manifesting Himself in and through all the relationships of human fellowship. 'That which was from the beginning . . . that eternal life declare we unto you, that you may have fellowship with us; and our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.' So the concern of Christianity, as a principle of social organization, is with a universal Life of fellowship expressing itself in various degrees through all the hierarchy of lesser loyalties. The universal Spirit organizes and articulates the whole Body. It is not a question of federating groups into a unity which will contain them all. Rather, we say that a pre-existing unity shows itself in and through a rich variety, so that each social unit is an expression of that Life which is fellowship.

What makes fellowship is man's innate social disposition when it is consciously evoked in response to a conscious recognition of God. All social life, wherever it may be found, is an expression of God, whose life is fellowship. From Him every family derives. But it is arrested and balked of its true development if it stops short of universalism. And this can only come by the recognition of God as the Source of all the will to unity, and by consciously entering into relations with Him. Perhaps we can only give the name of fellowship to the group-life whose centre is God in Christ. Thus natural friendship becomes Christian fellowship

when guided and penetrated by the spirit of Christ. There is genuine fellowship between friends, or in the social life of a given group when they love one another, because of Christ in them.

Christianity does not seek to organize a world-state by detaching men from their local loyalties, which would be psychologically unsound. It rather regards the local ties and loyalties as the creation of the universal Spirit in virtue of which our citizenship is in heaven. It regards the family, the city, and nation as at once the school of the larger loyalty and in themselves manifestations of it. It does not want us to be de-naturalized but super-naturalized in the City of God. Any Christian who has really thought out the full meaning of his inheritance in the universal Church will recognize both that through the life of Christ, mediated to him by the Church, he is a member of a kingdom which transcends all human antagonisms, and that in the immediate duties of the calling wherewith God has called him he will best discharge the obligation of citizenship in the City which is above.

Such a recovered grip on the significance of what is really implied in 'Churchmanship' would not make men in the wrong sense 'other-worldly.' It would rather cancel the bad division between what is popularly called 'church-work' and the duties of our home or our profession. The Church conceived in its eternal idea 'can present no other view than that a Christian's whole life is in the Church, whether he is thinking of his home, his business, his social recreations, or his citizenship.'

St. Paul himself would seem to be affirming very much what we have suggested here. It cannot be for nothing that the letter, which opens with the magnificent description of the Church eternal in the heavens manifesting to the ages to come the manifold wisdom of God's purposes, should end with common-sense workaday directions about the conduct of daily life and duty. The ordinary relationships of the home, between parents and children, servants, masters, and so on, are to be the expression in daily life of their membership in the Catholic Society, 'because we are members of his Body.' This sort of thing, he says, is implied in practice by belonging to the household of the saints.

St. Paul finds in our Lord's Ascension the supernatural source of fellowship and of the organic life of the Christian body. What the Ascension made possible was the redirection of the wills and desires of men and women. The Risen Christ had ascended far above all heavens. So that His

Church had not to confront the world merely with the statement of a problem: it carried the final answer in its hands. The Master, whose 'way' and whose influence it proclaimed, was enthroned as Sovereign in the Universe. He had taken on Himself man to deliver him. That is, He had redeemed human life. His Ascension and His coming in the Spirit implanted the fruits of this redemption in the hearts of all who accepted Him. He had come, as He promised, to 'abide in' them. Set free now from the limiting conditions of physical life in the days of His flesh, He was nearer to them than He had been before. He became the very life of their lives, so that all their instincts and desires revolved henceforth round a new Centre. Thus the Ascension meant, as St. Paul claims, the irruption into human society of a new and supernatural life, organizing the new fellowship. It is as individuals appropriate the life of the crucified and ascended Christ that genuine fellowship is made possible. 'Christ in you' is the source of fellowship.

As we look back over Christian history at the most signal comings of the Spirit, whether to small groups or to the Church at large, it seems to be true that one of the first effects has normally been a new consciousness of fellowship. But the times when the Church has been most strongly actuated by the impulses of mere group-loyalty have not been those in which the Spirit of Christ has been conspicuously present in her. The Roman Church was gregarious enough when it gave its support to the Inquisition, or the English Church when it extruded Wesley. But such acts are the antithesis of fellowship.

It is clear why the unity of the Church is necessarily a unity in variety. It is because it comes from the Spirit. It is the common supernatural life in which all its members share, but appropriated in different ways in accordance with all the differing conditions of time, temperament, and circumstances. To demand of the Church that, everywhere and always, it should be organized in the same form, and worship in precisely the same fashion, is not merely to ask for something very dull: it is to ask for something which is impossible. For the Spirit always creates fellowship: but equally it creates variety. Variety is ever a sign of life, and uniformity a mark of death. In the story of biological evolution there is one step which has never yet been explained. Certain varieties of species have a survival value and therefore survive. But how do we account for the varieties? We can only say that they are 'spontaneous'—that is to say, that somehow 'life' makes them. It

appears to be true, at least within certain limits, that the most vigorous breeds and stocks tend to run to most spontaneous variations. Where vitality is most intense, there we find the most variety. This is an illuminating analogy. The same law seems to hold in the realm of spirit. Wherever in the history of the Church the Spirit's pressure has been most intense, there the life of the Church has been most varied. It takes the experience of the whole race to explain the full significance of Christ.¹

TWENTY-FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Spiritual Poverty.

'Can two walk together, except they be agreed?'
—Am 3^a.

1. Wherever there is order, beauty, truth, there is harmony. Its basis is the complete agreement of the component parts which together form a perfect unity, whether in art or in life. You may perceive it in the sunrise or the sunset; in sculpture, poem, or musical symphony; where the celestial bodies revolve through the infinitudes of space; in the smoothly running machinery of an engine shop; in an ordered and disciplined human life. Harmony depends upon the adjustment of distinctive parts to a certain law or principle, and their consequent relation through that principle towards each other. When this relationship is violated, discord comes. Wherever unity is, God is.

And wheresoever, in His rich creation,

Sweet music breathes—in wave, or bird, or soul,
'Tis but the faint and far reverberation

Of that great tune to which the planets roll.

2. The Kingdom of God, which our Lord consistently preached, was an ideal of ordered and harmonious social life which involved then, and unhappily still involves, a drastic revolution in the ordinary man's scale of values. It demanded, not as an academic theory, but as a living reality, the brotherhood of men. The gospel of the Kingdom insisted that each individual owed responsibility to the community, and through the community to mankind. Whether he liked it or not, man was commissioned by the God who made him to be his brother's keeper. On this Jesus Christ was uncompromising.

Our Lord laid His fearless hand upon the outward observances of religion, hallowed even with the antiquity of Moses. Temple, altar, and ritual

¹ F. R. Barry, *St. Paul and Social Psychology*, 85.

He declared only to be effective when they expressed the worship of God in terms of purest spiritual reality. On this basis He founded His Church. It was to be a holy society whose members would, by their moral and spiritual splendour, attract the world to their Master. The Church was to be the outward and visible expression of a family, a household of God, whose children discovered their highest experience of unity with each other and with their Lord in a definitely social act—the Blessed Sacrament of His Body and Blood.

Man cannot approach his Maker, much less can he walk with Him, unless man be agreed with God, and God with man. And if the revelation of Christ as to the nature and character of God be true, it simply means that our hearts, if God we seek to know, must throb in sympathy with the heart of the Divine. The vast machinery of collective human life derives its driving force from the same law of harmony which the pealing anthem owns. Society moves in peace and concord, or in the reverse, according as the lives of men are, or are not, adjusted in a true relation to the mind of God which Christ manifested as passionately desiring the fellowship of His children.

3. This fundamental law of Christian life which conditions its harmony is summed up in that arresting and wistful expression of our Lord's: 'I have called you friends.' He did not say, 'I have called you all to think exactly alike.' Nor did He evidence our modern enthusiasm for hammering individuality down to the level of the mediocre. It is significant that whenever He said, 'Come, follow me!'—as He did to widely divergent human types—people always did so, without apparently questioning the why or the wherefore. He obviously just drew them to Himself by the personal magnetism of His unique inward attractiveness. After His disappearance from the earth it was the same with the apostolic band. They were a heterogeneous mixture with many dangerous opposites. No system of doctrine united them, for they had formulated no creed. The conception of the Church, as now we know it, had not become concrete to hold them all together. But the little society was cemented by the personal attractiveness of its members, the attractiveness of characters sweetened and made beautiful by the Spirit of Jesus Christ.

4. This is the gospel which our squabbling and turbulent age has largely forgotten, and in which alone lies the hope of its regeneration. In education and scientific achievement we may be going from strength to strength, but the drab poverty of

our souls is shamed by the very greatness of our works. The classes and the nations fight and wrangle, and the condition of our own national household, to say nothing of the human family, towards which we have our obligations, is a disgrace to a Christian country. But it is not the differences of opinion and divergences of religious and political thought that create the sordid mess of social injustice, class hatreds, wrongs, and suffering which cast a blight upon our era. It is the suspicion, the greed, the selfishness that blaspheme that friendship to which Christ called His followers.

Our need is not to sink our differences. It is earnestly to distinguish between prejudice and principle, and, loyal to our convictions, to attune them with our neighbour's on the keynote of sympathetic understanding and Christian love; so that our curses may turn to blessings and our bitter rancours into music; so that the barricades will be lowered sufficiently that across them we may look into a brother's eyes, and reach out to clasp a brother's hand.

In logic you are taught that contraries laid together appear the more evident. It follows that from honest controversy what is false will appear more false; what is true, more true. But Christian people ought to know, what some of our mischief-makers do not want to know, that what matters about their opinions is not that they happen to constitute their point of view, but whether their point of view happens to be Christ's point of view. To attack our brethren or invade their sacred rights, to thwart them in their legitimate efforts, to incite them to hatreds, to cherish towards them senseless dislikes because of selfish motives actuated by class, or sectional, or personal covetousness—that is alien to the mind of Christ. We have, indeed, as Christians, no right to support any view, political, social, or religious, unless we have taken scrupulous care thoroughly to convince ourselves that its practical operation would be calculated to further the best interests of mankind. 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness' is a policy difficult enough even for the best of us; but it is the obstacles and hardship of the Christian life that constitute an appeal to all that is chivalrous and heroic in human nature. The peacemakers—the most difficult rôle of all—shall be called the children of God.

5. Let us hope that from the strife and tumult of our generation we may learn this wisdom. The Church has to learn that the better ambition is not to become stronger with more authority, but better with more humility. The nations have to learn

that a country finds security and more than transient glory only in proportion to the moral greatness of its people and the extent which they are willing to serve the world. Commerce and industry have to learn that Christianity demands as an elementary principle that a trade's, or an industry's, first function is to perform an act of service to the community, and only when this is honestly fulfilled has it a justification to be a money-making concern. We average individuals have to learn that though we may be entitled to legitimate profits, aspirations, and ambitions, it is not we who count; since 'the ship is more than the crew.'

There are signs that the ears of this groping, disillusioned generation are turning to listen to that cry across the ages: 'I have called you friends.' If Christendom can but be faithful to its trust, a day will come, in God's good time, when the praises which men raise to Him will be not only with their lips but in their lives, and when they will worship in a reality we have never known; when in a Society delivered from the love of luxury and the pursuit of vanity, and in a common life freed from selfish rivalries and mellowed with the love and friendship of Jesus Christ, not alone in these temples where His honour dwelleth, but in every place shall be lifted in truth the hymn of adoration—'All the earth doth worship Thee, the Father everlasting.'¹

SUNDAY BEFORE ADVENT.

The Brevity of Human Life.

'For what is your life? It is even a vapour, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away.' —Ja 4¹⁴.

Human life is painfully brief. The pathway which leads from the dawn of birth to that western horizon whereon 'the dusk is waiting for the night' is passed over with disquieting rapidity. The fact of life's brevity is one of those inescapable truths which has ever haunted the mind and heart of man. St. James, having raised this most searching question, 'What is your life?' proceeds to answer it from the standpoint of its utter brevity.

Literature is filled with rare figures and emblems denoting the swift passage of the years. What is your life? It is as a weaver's shuttle, a postman's knock, the falling leaf, the dissolving cloud, a broken sleep, the guest of a day, a passing ship, the flight of an arrow, the fading flower, the night-watch of a sentinel, or a tale that is told around a winter's fire.

1. The initial truth which flowers forth in every

¹ C. L. Warr, in *British Preachers*, iii. 19.

faithful heart is the fact that we are Christians and our trust is in a Christ-like God. In spite of life's brevity, therefore, we shall not permit ourselves to become victimized by any pagan despair. And this means, first of all, that we shall not become fretful simply because it is not given us to see the full fruitage of our life's endeavours. We shall hold our hearts from all disquietude by recognizing the fact that our lives are keyed to a career which is very short, while with the world's Creator 'a thousand years are but as one day.'

2. The second truth which, because we believe in Christ and Christ's God, lifts us above the despair of paganism is this: we are immortal and, therefore, our soul's existence is in no fatal manner related to time. Our faith is centred upon the Risen Lord. From the doorway of the conquered tomb comes the certain assurance of an angelic voice which says, 'He is not here, he is risen.'

Christianity, says Professor Harnack, is essentially and uniquely the religion of eternal life. We know that it was upon the power of the Risen Christ that the Apostles took their stand, wrote their letters, made their converts, and, with no weapon save that of the Spirit, withstood their persecutors; and this has been the secret of the Church's most glorious victories ever since.

And it is only as we are able to experience eternal life here and now, a present reality quite as well as a future hope, that we will be enabled to do our best work for men and for God. With true spiritual insight Dostoevsky asserted that there are but two classes of people in the world, those who know eternal life and those who do not. With the great Russian we are led to believe that the fate of civilization is in the keeping of those who know themselves to be the citizens of eternity. Dr. Joseph Fort Newton has said: 'Life everywhere grows in dignity, meaning, and worth when it is lived in the fellowship of eternal things. Under the expansive pressure of eternal values we become aware of what life is, what it means, and what it prophesies, eager only to do the will of God, whether to-morrow finds us toiling here, or out yonder with the dwellers of the City on the Hill.'

3. Though the years are both few and short, yet it is our moral duty to accept them and to do our best with them. The fact that we are not the creatures of time but the children of the resurrection does not imply that we have no imperative duties to perform in the world. On the contrary, we have, each of us, a work to do which none other, not even the Infinite Father, can well do in our stead.

In one of his classic utterances, Burke has defined civilization as 'a contract between the noble dead, the living, and the unborn.' We do well to eulogize the good and great of other days, to recall the names of a Washington, or a Lincoln, and to erect monuments to their memory. Yet how infinitely better it would be for us to emulate their spirit instead of merely reverencing their names!

4. But a final implication of the fact of life's brevity must be stated. If we are to contribute most to life and, at the same time, to receive the most from life, we must learn to put first things first. There is no art known to man which is comparable with the art of Christian living. The beauty of a Gothic cathedral or of an ocean sunrise is far inferior to the beauty of a Christ-possessed and Christ-possessing man or woman. Such a one is the chief glory of God's cosmic enterprise. Ruskin informs us that a really great painter may be known by the things which he leaves out of his pictures. Likewise, the art of Christian living is fundamentally the art of choosing the best from a great number of relative values. This matter of putting the most into life and, therefore, of getting the most out of life through our choice of the best of many relative values is almost boundless in its implications. It will always be found, however, that the real issues of life are not resident in outward circumstances, but in our inner dispositions. Says Dr. John Henry Jowett: 'The big thing is not luxury, but contentment; not accumulated art treasure, but a fine artistic appreciation; not a big library, but a serene studiousness; not a big estate, but a large vision.'

In one of the most beautiful and yet most searching passages of the sixth book of his *Confessions*, Rousseau relates how he asked himself in what manner he might make the most of the brief interval which stood between the present and the day of his death. And it was Victor Hugo who said that every man and woman is under sentence of death with 'a sort of indefinite reprieve.' Well, death may not matter—does not matter—but the way in which we use the reprieve and the choices which we must inevitably make during the reprieve—these matter tremendously!

Therefore, let us fulfil our contract with 'the noble dead, the living, and the unborn'—be earnest, but not fretful: be diligent, but also patient, 'seek first the kingdom,' learn to put first things first, live and love as though prepared to die, and then die prepared to live!¹

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Problem of Doubt.

'If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself.'—Jn 7¹⁷.

It is a significant fact that an age of comparative spiritual stagnation synchronizes with a faltering grasp upon the essential beliefs of our Christian faith. It is well, then, for us to go back to the method of Jesus. An examination of the gospel narratives reveals in clear and striking outline His solution of the problem of doubt. It amounts to this: That He refused to acquiesce in the demand for intellectual certitude. He resolutely withheld the demonstrable 'sign' which was to compel belief and to dazzle the mind of man into a willing acceptance of His claims and His revelation. He indicates another way to the desired goal. 'If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether I speak from myself.' The appeal, then, is not primarily to the intellect, but to the will.

Now this is of immense significance to-day in view of the revolution in thought which is going on in our midst and the new 'world view' opening out before us as the result of the new concept of creative evolution. The dogmatism of nineteenth-century scientific 'results' is bankrupt. The claims of science to certitude are gone—the 'facts' of to-day are the 'fictions' of to-morrow. The thoroughgoing determinism—the so-called laws of Nature—the idea of an inevitable evolutionary progress is now discredited. From the camp of science and philosophy a new doctrine is being preached. Creative evolution is to be the all-powerful concept of the years to come. We are now assured that 'novelty' is a real thing occurring in the universe, and a place must be found for it in our philosophies. That which was regarded as unthinkable and impossible is now acknowledged to be fact. Hence, in spite of the hatred of scientists and philosophers for 'novelty,' we are now assured that the old Christian idea of 'creation out of nothing' is truer to the facts than the common-sense and apparently self-evident maxim—out of nothing comes nothing. What was mere philosophic foolishness—the old Genesis story ridiculed out of the arena of intellectual thought and dismissed in favour of the conception of creation out of pre-existing material—is now acceptable in the light of our new concept of creative evolution. In this doctrine of creation out of nothing, a philosopher tells us now, the Christian Church was

¹ H. D. M'Keehan, *The Patrimony of Life*, 53.

right and philosophy was wrong. 'A world that generates novelty *is* creating itself out of nothing. It must be pronounced capable of arising out of nothing; only we must add that the creative process is still continuing.'

What, then, is the significance of this new concept of creative evolution for our purposes? We may avoid the extremes to which its advocates are rushing whilst we seize upon the truth it contains. If there is a tireless, unceasing creative activity of God, the Creator, at work in the universe, and we can get some inkling of what His purpose is, then we can *by an act of will* become fellow-labourers with Him in the work of making a new world.

God's revelation through Christ is a revelation in word and in deed. Read the life of Jesus Christ again in this connexion and let us ask ourselves this question: Can we conceive of any better thing happening in our midst to-day than that the principles and ideals He advocated and worked for should be practised amongst men? Could a better good descend upon us than the establishment on a large scale of the Kingdom of God upon earth? If we can conceive of some better plan, let us bend our wills to its achievement. But, if we cannot think of anything better, His call to all men of goodwill to-day is this: 'The world in which you live is not what I want it to be. It lies in your power to make it a better world if you really want to. If you will work and labour and sacrifice for this end, *it can be changed*, and lo, I am with you all the days! I am here in your midst, unseen but ever-active, working with you and pouring out My life in sacrifice in you, for you, through you, for one object—that the earth may be filled with the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea.' This is the appeal of Jesus Christ to-day.

Now suppose we have men in our midst who are still hesitating—still held back by intellectual doubts and moral cowardice from joining up and doing their bit for the Kingdom. What message have we for them? Simply this: So long as you are content to tarry with the Jerusalem scribes and lawyers, asking hard questions which cannot be answered and demanding proofs which will not be supplied, the work suffers from your abstinence, the enemy makes headway because of your cowardice, the Kingdom tarries because of your inaction. Come to a decision. Do something. In the *Purgatorio*, next to the slackers and the slothful, and far removed from the light, the great Italian seer, Dante, placed the doubters and the sceptics.

If men *do* His will, what follows? They make the great discovery. They find that the Unseen Power behind, and in, and through the whole world and human life is not passive, inactive, indifferent, but active, dynamic, warm, and full of life—a love which responds to our advance and, far from waiting and holding back, rushes to meet us and overwhelm us. In prayer and communion, to which we are driven in the very work in which we find ourselves engaged, we discover the Presence of our Master whom we are serving and who gives us grace up to the measure of our need. Thus, doing His will we come to know Him and gain an assurance otherwise unattainable of the truth of the doctrine He taught.

And surely this has always been God's witness of Himself to men, a witness in Creative *Deed*. The test of Christ's Divinity and the claim of His Judgeship lies in this direction. Some day we must give an account of the deeds done in the body, and the nature of the judgment is to depend upon our organic relationship to Him, which again is tested by our organic relationship one to another in Him. If we are discovered to have touched any of the vast masses of men at a sensitive point in active, loving service, at that point where we have touched any of them, we have touched Him. He claims to stand in an all-inclusive relationship to men, so that He cannot be numbered as merely one of them, but is ideally all in all. 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these least, ye did it unto me.'

And does He ask us to do what He refuses Himself to undertake? Not so. Test Him in the light of His creative activity in times past. He has wrought wondrously in this universe of time and space and at a certain point in the historical process, after a long preparation and a gradual revelation, *He has intervened with decisive results* in the affairs of men and done a deed which has made the future of the world and of man's destiny other than it would have been or could have been had He not done what He did. The supreme proof of God in action is the Cross. The atoning work of Calvary is something the glory of which is no figment of the imagination, but still in our skies to-day.

An intellectual certitude of His divinity may be wanting, but a moral and spiritual conviction of its truth is the possession of all those who have found Him mighty to save. If He be not God Himself in the act of forgiving, we have still to reckon with the All-Holy God in the matter of our human transgressions, but those who know the gospel to be indeed 'Good News,' know also that their faith in Jesus Christ is faith in the Eternal—

that in Him they find God, and One who is Redeemer and Saviour.

Short of such an experience, so warm, so vital, so deep in its richness, it is not altogether wonderful that men are discovered who can, and do, pour ridicule upon the whole subject, and in self-satisfied pride prefer to regard (with Bernard Shaw) forgiveness as a beggar's refuge, and wish if they can

to pay their debts. But the biggest proof of the present creative activity of the Creator to-day is the transformation He still works in human life, re-creating sinners into saints, lifting up the fallen and degraded, bringing the lost back and making us 'new creatures' in Christ Jesus.¹

¹ H. M. Reiton, *The Catholic Conception of the Incarnation*, 48.

Recent Foreign Theology.

THIS is really a long review, containing forty-eight open letters written by O. Ritschl to his friend Rade about Rade's recently published *Dogmatic*.¹ The frankness of the conversation is delightful. Not only so, but the book has great independent value, for Ritschl is as learned and informing a writer on all that concerns Dogmatic as Germany can put forward. Even more suggestive than his comments upon Rade are his *obiter dicta*—sometimes worked out at considerable length—on other theologians of the day. Thus we are told that Herrmann was a preacher more than a dogmatician, which has a measure of truth and yet leaves us pleased that Herrmann was as he was.² It is justifiably urged that Herrmann was wrong in rejecting the idea of *system* in theology; for, as Ritschl pointedly remarks, we need a synoptic view of Christianity, and in being systematic we need not in the least be purely deductive in method. Mysticism is religion, but not Christian religion. As against Otto, the point is made (as previously by Professor Kenneth Edward) that 'the feeling of creatureliness' is not a simple but a complex feeling. One of the least convincing pages in the book is that in which the writer reiterates A. Ritschl's mistaken objections to the idea of the Divine anger. Anger, he contends, is a momentary loss of self-control, which we cannot predicate of God. Was it so when Jesus looked round upon the Pharisees with indignation? Granting for the moment that we cannot imagine even a very good man being angry without being also slightly fanatical, we must not make the limits of our imagination binding for our thought of God.

Ritschl with justice repels Holl's view—held long ago by Newman—that God justifies because

He intends to sanctify; if taken seriously it is indisputably a view that generates self-righteousness.

Some unusually interesting comments are made on the theology of Karl Barth. The Swiss school have hastily developed a one-sided reading of Luther's paradoxes, and their feverish thought is the result of being mere onlookers during the War—for spectators often are more profoundly upset by suffering than the sufferers themselves. Barth's point of departure is the mind of the anxious inquirer rather than fully Christian faith. This is worth thinking over, but does it carry us very far to call Barth one-sided? Of course he is, but then so were Schleiermacher, Hegel, and Albrecht Ritschl himself. Every new movement zigzags at a tangent, and if we are to get the good of Barth we shall have to listen to his powerful voice, allowing for his over-emphasis.

These essays² on Calvin's work, from the pen of the late Professor Paul Lobstein of Strassbourg, have been gathered together and edited by the filial care of his son, M. Edouard Lobstein. They include some which appeared originally in German, and have now been rendered into French. In a day when many are turning afresh to Calvin for inspiring guidance, these scholarly papers, informed by a sympathy which is never excessive, will be received with pleasure. They treat of Calvin as preacher, as theologian and religious philosopher, and as commentator on Scripture; shorter notes also are given on particular episodes in the Reformer's life.

We are shown how Calvin as really as Luther is a preacher to the people, simple and elevated by

¹ *Theologische Briefe an Martin Rade*, by Otto Ritschl (Leopold Klotz Verlag, Gotha, 1928, pp. 132; M. 3.60).

² *Études sur la Pensée et l'Oeuvre de Calvin*, by Paul Lobstein (éditions de 'La Cause'; Neuilly, 1927, pp. 185; 9 fr.).

turns, familiar and pathetic, ironical and solemn. Never was there a more Biblical preacher. Lobstein dwells especially on Calvin's method of preaching from the Old Testament and of setting forth dogma. He speaks plainly of the preacher's power of vituperation and of the abuses by which it was, if not excused, at least not unnaturally provoked. In the admirable studies devoted to Calvin's dogmatic work, particularly his *Institutio*, it is pointed out how his chief aims were three in number. First, he sought, as a systematic theologian, to be strictly Biblical; and here he fostered among Protestants the doctrine of verbal inspiration. It is scarcely accurate, however, to call him, as Lobstein does, 'the creator of this dogma,' for Luther had taught it undisguisedly before him. In any case, much of its evil was neutralized by its never-failing concomitant, namely, the doctrine

of the inward witness of the Spirit. Secondly his theology is in principle theocentric, above all in his doctrine, at once triumphant and tragic, of predestination. Finally, Calvin aimed at a system of practical efficacy. 'He is the irreconcilable foe of scholasticism; he has no desire for a theology essentially verbal and formalist, but demands truth which legitimates itself by its blessed and salutary effects, a doctrine which impels men to action, which finds expression in the fruits of holiness and righteousness, and passes finally into a life dedicated to the service of the Lord.' Attention must also be called to a penetrating paper on Calvin's view of religious knowledge—a view which to some degree explains the profound admiration cherished for Calvin's work by Ritschl.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Edinburgh.

Contributions and Comments.

Paul and Peter at Rome.

THAT St. Paul was at Rome for at least two years, if not more, and died there, no one has ever doubted. Whether St. Peter was ever there, or had any special relation to the Roman Church, is one of the endlessly debated points of controversy in New Testament history. It crops up again in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for August, and is not likely to be ever settled beyond dispute. I have no intention of adding to the mass of matter written about such familiar questions as the meaning of Clement of Rome in his allusion to the end of the two great apostles, or of 'Babylon' in 1 Peter. But I think that the Epistle to the Romans gives an impression about St. Paul and the Roman Church which is not without some bearing on St. Peter's relation to it.

One sees at once that St. Paul has to be tactful, one might almost say diplomatic, in venturing to write at all to the saints at Rome. He disclaims any attempt to assert authority over them, such as he asserts in letters to his own churches. There could never have been any question of his coming to Rome, as he actually threatened to come to Corinth 'with a rod.' He longed to see them, and in the meantime he writes, simply in order to 'impart some spiritual gift,' that he and they may

be comforted, 'each of us by the other's faith, both yours and mine.' He had oftentimes proposed to come, but had been hindered. Were those repeated hindrances all due to difficulties of travel—he constantly overcame much greater difficulties of that sort—or to pressure of other work? The latter reason no doubt operated, and in Ro 15¹ he implies that it was because it had become less insistent, that he at length saw his way to pay the Roman Christians a visit. But he was evidently well aware of the necessity of having a strong centre of the gospel at the centre of the Empire, and believed that it was essential that he, the Apostle of the Nations, should have some share in the moulding of Church life there. One would have thought that with such a purpose he would have managed to make time somehow to carry it out, and not allowed it to be put off over and over again. And why, when he at last announces his intention of coming, does he twice say (Ro 15^{24, 28}) that he is on his way to Spain? The Church of Rome was far more important, and almost certainly far larger, than any of the churches in Spain were then likely to be. There may be such a thing, I take it, as Christian diplomacy, though not, of course, duplicity, and it looks as if the Apostle welcomed the call to Spain, whatever it was—and no doubt he felt it to be a real one—as giving him

an extra reason, and providing an opportunity which people at Rome would themselves recognize, of carrying out his long-cherished project of visiting them.

For evidently in proposing to pay them an Apostolic visit, or even in writing them an Apostolic letter, he feels that he is broaching a delicate matter and must step warily. He must make it clear that there, as in other places, it was not his aim to preach the gospel where Christ was already named (Ro 15²⁰), still less to build upon another man's foundation. Indeed, the fear that he might be thought to be doing this seems to have been one of the things that had hindered him from coming (Ro 15²²). His visit would not be for the purpose of asserting authority. Perhaps it would not even be Apostolic, or pastoral, as other visits were. It would rather be for mutual edification and comfort, profitable to himself as well as, he hopes, to them.

Why should he need to be so tactful, almost apologetic, in approaching the Romans in person or by letter? It looks as if, to use a homely phrase, he was afraid of treading on some one's toes. Whose? Some one of importance, some one with whom it was not always easy to keep on good terms, some one with whom there might be difficulties, either on his own account or through the action of his followers. He had had difficulties about this time with 'those pre-eminent apostles' (2 Co 12¹¹, R.V. margin), who are most probably Peter, James, and John. He does not in Romans make a cryptic reference to them, as he does more than once in 2 Co. But they were probably still in his mind. If so, Peter is the most likely of the three. If he was the founder of the Church at Rome, either personally or by deputy, that would certainly account for the need of tact on Paul's part. It would not be necessary to suppose that Peter had evangelized Rome. Probably the seed was carried there, as elsewhere, by travelling disciples, and sprung up and bore fruit, like the seed growing secretly. But when it was time to organize and establish the Christian society, they would require the presence, or, at least, the advice, of an apostle. If the Roman Church was at first largely Jewish, as is quite likely, they would send to the Apostle of the Circumcision. He would not be slow to see the importance of the occasion, and would naturally go himself, if possible. Conse-

quently, if Peter's work had preceded, Paul would be almost in the position of a bishop intruding into another bishop's diocese. He was always careful to keep to his own province (2 Co 10¹³, R.V.), but the importance of the Church in the capital of the world, the danger lest it might be subject to Jewish prejudices (Ro 14 and 15), the certainty that the Gentile element in it would increase, made him decide to take a risk, and approach it first by a letter, the most deliberate and carefully planned of all his letters—indeed, Romans has with some show of truth been called an essay—and then, as he meant to do, in person. The way in which this intention was frustrated, but overruled for good, is of course one of the most wonderful things in Apostolic history.

It is not suggested that St. Peter was at Rome when St. Paul wrote his letter. But he might have been there before, or after, or both. As to the puzzling sentence in Ac 28²¹, if it is not made any plainer, neither is the difficulty increased by the hypothesis of a connexion between Rome and St. Paul's chief colleague and chief difficulty in the Apostolic band.

W. BARTLETT.

Helmdon, Northants.

Isaiah xiv. 19.

וַאֲמָה הַשְּׁלֵכָה מִקְבְּרָהּ בְּנֶצֶר נִתְּעַב לְבַשׁ הָרִיחַ

'But thou art cast forth away from thy sepulchre like an abominable branch, clothed with the slain' (R.V.). The phrase 'abominable branch' is very harsh. Why call a branch abominable? And the phrase 'clothed with the slain' can only mean that this particular corpse has, as its garment, the slain men on the battlefield. But a very simple expedient restores the sense. Transfer the **נ** of נִתְּעַב to the next word, and read **נִתְּעַב בְּלִבָּשׁ**, and translate, 'But thou hast been cast forth away from thy sepulchre like a *broken* branch (from נָתַע : the Niph. occurs Job 4¹⁰), *in* slain men's weeds.'

Whether this simple emendation has occurred to any one else I do not know. It is not noticed in Kittel.

JAMES T. HUDSON.

Kingston, Jamaica.

Entre Nous.

Men and Movements.

The Rev. F. A. Iremonger during his editorship of *The Guardian* had the happy idea of having a personal interview with a number of prominent personalities in the Church of England. Most of those chosen were specially identified with some movement in the Church. So, for example, we have an interview with Dr. Temple, the leader of Copec. 'The object of the Copec, in a sentence,' answered the bishop, 'is to attempt to apply the principles of the Gospel to the ordering of social and economic life.' Another interview was with the Rev. G. A. Studdert-Kennedy, M.C. In it the aims of the Industrial Christian Fellowship are brought out. 'Crowds are irrational. The danger of democracy is that men are swayed merely by their feelings. What we have got to do is to sublimate these feelings, and make men be moved not by them but by a passion for the Kingdom of God. That is what is meant by the usual phrases about a Christian outlook on industrial and economic problems. . . . I am never tired of repeating that what the movement requires is good men with a sense of the over-lordship of God and reverence for Him, who don't blame their neighbours but themselves.' In conversation with the Rev. P. T. B. Clayton, M.C., one detail after another of Toc H. was explained to Mr. Iremonger—its five hundred honorary padres, its Groups and Branches and Houses, and the awarding of the Lamp which is given to a Group only when it can point to a good record of corporate service. 'Yes, I know all about that,' said the Padre; 'but you must spare a bit more space to explain that in our Houses we have every sort and kind of men living cheek by jowl. . . . And each man pays on a sliding scale, according to his earnings. In one House we have two men sharing the same room, one paying four guineas a week and the other seven and sixpence. The average is twenty in a House, with ten guest-beds which are reserved for men who are looking for work or running away from it. Toc H. is meant to be the biggest Friendly Society of its age.'

The last two interviews—all are now issued in book form by Messrs. Longmans (*Men and Movements in the Church*; 4s. net)—are with the Bishop of Birmingham and the Bishop of Chelmsford. These did not appear in *The Guardian*, but are now published for the first time. Three fundamental truths of religion, Dr. Barnes thinks, should receive a fresh

emphasis. The first of these is the Fatherhood of God. 'I prefer "Fatherhood" to "Love." There is a severe side to the character of God which the idea of Fatherhood retains. As is well known, leaders of modern physical and biological science show a distinct recoil from mechanical concepts of development. But they are naturally led to a somewhat colourless pantheism if they confine attention to scientific research. I would have thought the Church of England show the necessity of passing from such pantheism to belief in God as our Father. Secondly, I would have the Church preach Jesus as the Christ, One Whom the modern world can rightly regard as the Anointed of God. . . . Liberal Protestantism presents the world with an idealistic social reformer. Catholicism puts forward the central figure of a mystery-religion. We need to present, instead of such fancies, the Son of Man. . . . Thirdly, I wish to urge that the ethical content of the Gospel should be more simply and courageously proclaimed by the Church. We relegate the Beatitudes to the Gospel for All Saints' Day. We ought to have them Sunday by Sunday to make men understand the mind of Jesus Christ. After all, He is the peculiar glory of the Christian religion.'

Evangelistic Missions.

Parochial Missions, far from having had their day, have never been more needed, says Canon Peter Green. And by a parochial mission he means an Evangelistic Mission, where the aim is to induce men and women to make the great decision and to accept Jesus as Saviour, Master, and Lord.

Under what circumstances should a Mission be attempted? With quite surprising frequency Canon Green gets letters in which the writer says: 'I came to this parish a short time ago. Owing to the long illness of the late incumbent (or his great age, or some other cause) the whole place is utterly dead. Would you advise me to have a Mission?'

His answer in these circumstances is an immediate negative. 'If a clergyman finds a parish dead and his church empty, he must set to and gather a congregation by the ordinary methods of visiting, Sunday School work, the after-care of confirmation candidates, and attention to communicants. Several years of steady pastoral work may not be too long a period in which to build up such a body of workers as shall justify aggressive evangelistic work.'

If when the congregation is cold and dead that is not the time for aggressive evangelistic work, what is to be done then? 'Try a dose of Foreign Missions,' Canon Green answers. 'I can only say that nothing that I have ever known, in the whole course of my ministry, has ever done so much to quicken and revive a parish, or done it so quickly and with such lasting results,' as the Missioner Mission held in the rural deanery in 1923. Any priest who thinks of having a Parochial Mission should read Canon Peter Green's book on the whole subject which has just been published by Messrs. Longmans. The title is *Parochial Missions To-day* (4s. net). He will find in it the fullest advice on such subjects as the length of a Mission—longer than ten days at any rate, and, if possible, lasting over four Sundays; the number of missionaries; whether a children's Mission should be held at the same time; preparation for the Mission; how to secure a great volume of prayer; advertisement; preliminary visitation, method of decision, and after meetings.

This is Canon Green's mind on the question of decision. 'There must be some definite act of decision. . . . "Where there is no expression there is no impression" is a sound maxim in religion as well as in education.' People do not want to be committed. 'As a working lad once expressed it to me, their attitude is "I don't want to put my hand out any further than I can pull it back again."' The Mission then must supply opportunities for confessing Christ openly, and the confessions should not be made too easy.

After the Mission is over, should we try to make the emotion which has been stirred up permanent? If not, should we try to stir it up periodically? Canon Green believes that the Mission atmosphere should not be prolonged; that the Mission Hymn-book (for example) should not be used one Sunday evening a month. 'What we ought to aim at is so to use these times of warmed affections as to form habits of right living, habits which, "by a patient continuance in well-doing," may build up lasting Christian character.'

Confessing Christ.

'When the night came on which I made up my mind to ask for decision I stood for a few moments on the chancel step while no one moved. Then a man of about sixty, a leading man in civic life and the head of a great business, came slowly up the aisle and took a card. He was absolutely the last man one would have expected to act so. He

said to me afterwards,—"I think caution, call it cowardice if you like, has spoilt my religion all my life. If I could have preached at a street corner, or stood a bit of persecution for religion, it would have made all the difference. But I'm no great speaker, even on matters I really know something about. And no one gets persecuted for religion these days. It's the other way round; you get praised and flattered. But that going out before the congregation was just what I wanted. No, that's wrong! I did not want it. I hated it. I was all sweating and trembling. But if I did not want it, I needed it."'¹

Ecclesiasticus 5°.

'There are texts that are elusive and intriguing on the surface; they seem to deal with one subject, plain and practical; but in the heart of them they deal with something else, deeper, more significant, something moral and spiritual. "Winnow not with every wind, and go not into every way." On the surface of it, it deals with farming; in the heart of it, it deals with morals—or the wise conduct of life.

'What did the son of Sira mean by winnowing with every wind? In the old days corn was winnowed by being tossed by a shovel into the air, so that the wind might carry away the chaff, while the heavier grain fell back upon the threshing-floor. One had, therefore, to consider the wind before one decided to winnow the grain. To winnow in a very light wind was to waste one's time and toil, for the chaff would not be carried away but would fall again on to the threshing-floor. To winnow in a very strong wind was to run the risk of having the good grain carried away along with the chaff; so that a man who winnowed in every wind was likely at once to waste his time, waste his toil, and lose his harvest. We smile as we look at the picture of the man winnowing in every wind. William Law in his "Serious Call" has given us a full-length portrait of the man under the character of "Flatus."

'But in the moral sphere, in the conduct of life, what is the equivalent of winnowing in every wind? It is partly explained by the sentence that follows, "Winnow not with every wind, and go not into every way." The suggestion seems to be that we must exercise some discrimination and some restraint in the things we attempt to do. We must not try to *excel* in everything, or even *be* in everything. . . . There is a kind of man who has a

¹ Peter Green, *Parochial Missions To-day*, 91.

fidgety desire to be on every Committee, but he is not much use on any of them.

'But there is a more serious side of this restless vanity—this itch to be in everything. In giving way to it a man loses the power to fix steadily the direction of his will, and so takes up one thing after another and drops each in turn. He is more eager to express himself, as he puts it, than to pull steadily in the harness. He may even become curious of too many things, foolishly desirous of tasting every fruit in the garden of life, even the forbidden fruit. One might add a verse from another chapter, "My son, meddle not with many matters; for if thou meddle much thou shalt not be innocent," or as Dr. John Tauler puts it, "He who entangles himself with a multitude of matters, outward or inward, and will meddle with everything that is going forward, will also have a share in the evil thereof." It is possible for a man to know life too well for his security. "Winnow not with every wind, and go not into every way" is wise counsel.

'But after all the man who does this is not so much any particular individual as just vain human nature in general, which needs to be checked, controlled, disciplined, that it may acquire singleness of aim and steadfastness of purpose. And so the son of Sira gives our restless human nature this counsel.'¹

'There is nothing hid from the heat thereof.'

A volume of essays in Mr. Boreham's best vein has just been published by the Epworth Press—*The Fiery Crags* (5s. net). He is now the author of more than twenty-two volumes. The publishers' title-page and then add etc. etc. An amazing output! The first essay in *The Fiery Crags* is called 'The Boy,' and with it we at once enter into Mr. Boreham's confidence and rejoice with him over a great happening in his family. "It's a boy!" The thing seemed incredible. Nobody knew what to make of it. We had spent nearly twenty years on the cultivation of a choice little garden of girls. But a boy! Who could have dreamed of such an astounding and sensational development?

Heat is the subject of the last essay, and it starts in the delightfully inconsequent way characteristic of Mr. Boreham—from a casual remark made to him. 'I was chatting in the park last night with Basil Clements, the manager of a big gas concern. "We have made up our minds," he observed,

between the puffs of a particularly fragrant cigar, "We have made up our minds that we've been sailing on the wrong tack. We've always regarded *light* as the crucial test of gas; but now we pay more attention to its *heat*. We have come to the conclusion that heat is the vital quality!"' Mr. Boreham ponders his friend's words, and these are some of his thoughts. 'We have a ponderous literature,' he says, 'penned in praise of the light of the sun. But David says nothing about the light of the sun. He extols its heat for three reasons. (1) When, under the guidance of the astronomers, I contemplate the sun—a furnace of fire a million times the size of the earth—I see that heat is its essential output: light is a mere by-product, valuable but distinctly incidental.

'(2) Light is superficial; heat is profound. Light glances on the surface; heat is all-diffusive, all-pervasive, all-penetrating. The light is easily evaded. The photographer knows that. Darken the window or descend a mine, and you are beyond the sovereignty of the sunlight. But the heat! From the core of the earth to its crust, there is nowhere a grain of sand or a speck of dust or a drop of water, or an atom of matter of any kind, that is beyond the influence of the sun's all-searching heat.

'(3) The light represents the things that we see; the heat represents the things that we feel; and it is by the things that we feel that life is dominated and controlled. The entire history of mankind goes to show this. "How do you know that there is any Christ? You never saw Him!" demands Augustine St. Clare, taking his stand on the light-principle. "I feel Him in my soul, massa!" replies poor Uncle Tom, taking his stand on the heat-principle. Robert Elsmere tells his wife of his doubts and of his intention of leaving the ministry. "Robert, my husband, my darling," she cries, in an agony of entreaty, "it cannot be! It is a madness, a delusion! Come away with me, away from books and work, into some quiet place where He can make Himself heard! . . . What can books and arguments matter to you and me? Have we not *known* and *felt* Him as He is, Robert? Have we not? Come!"'

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

¹ A. F. Taylor, *Meditations in Ecclesiasticus*, 77.